



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

3 3433 06740411 5

60AL

7
9

34
33



THE
THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY
JOURNAL.

EDITED BY DAVID N. LORD.

1855

VOL. VII.

JULY, 1854—APRIL, 1855.

~~~~~

NEW YORK:  
PUBLISHED BY FRANKLIN KNIGHT,  
138 NASSAU STREET.  
1855.

ENTERED according to Act of Congress in the year 1854, by  
DAVID N. LORD,  
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of New York.

---

R. CRAIGHEAD, Printer,  
53 Vesey Street, New York.

358  
106

THE  
THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY  
JOURNAL.

---

VOLUME VII.

JULY, 1854.

NUMBER I.

---

ART. I.—CHRIST'S SECOND COMING.

BY THE EDITOR.

IN our previous articles on this subject, we have shown that Christ's second coming is to take place at the time of the destruction of the antichristian powers, of the resurrection of the holy dead, and of the restoration of the Israelites.

IV. There is a large class of passages in which it is shown with equal distinctness and emphasis that its time is to be that of the conversion of the Gentiles, and the extension of his empire over the whole world. Of these, Psalms ii., lxxii., and cx., are of an earlier date than any that we have hitherto quoted, and they, with the other Messianic Psalms, like Dan. vii. 13, 14, Zech. xiv. 9, and Rev. xi. 15, indicate that Christ is, at his second coming, to be invested with the dominion of the earth; that the kings of the nations are then to be gathered together to prevent the establishment of his kingdom; that he is to judge and destroy them and their hosts; and that he is immediately thereafter to bring all the tribes of the earth to submission to his sceptre, raise them to exalted knowledge, and crown them with peace and blessedness.

Thus, in Psalm ii., from the pen of David, the nations are first exhibited as in a rage, and the kings of the earth as taking counsel together and arraying themselves against the Messiah, for the purpose of preventing him from reigning over them. "Why do the nations rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against Jehovah and his Messiah: (saying) Let us break their bands asunder and cast away their cords from us."—Vs. 2-3. The period to which the prediction refers is thus to be one in which the nations, instead of being converted, are to be in alienation from Christ, and indulging in a vain dream of a triumph over him; promising themselves, not improbably, like the infidel crowds of Europe at the present time, a total extrication from the restraints of his religion: while the kings of the earth are to unite in schemes for a complete extinction of his followers and his authority. This corresponds to the representation, Rev. xvi. 13-16, that they are, at the time of his second coming, to be assembled for a great battle against him. Their object is to be to prevent the re-establishment of the Israelites in Jerusalem, and thereby confute the prediction that he is to be their king, conquer all their foes, and extend his sceptre over the whole earth. But Jehovah will interpose and confound them, and turn their impious attempt into derision. "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh, the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and terrify them in his displeasure."—Vs. 4, 5. Their terror will be caused not merely by his voice, but by the visible presence also, we learn from Rev. vi. 15-17, of God Almighty and the Lamb at his right hand; for they are, in their consternation, to cry to the mountains and rocks to fall on them, and hide them from the face of *him that sitteth on the throne*, and from the wrath of *the Lamb*, for the great day of his wrath has come." The Lord God Almighty—the Father—is to be visible, therefore, as well as the Lamb, as he was in the vision beheld by the apostle, Rev. iv. v. And God the Almighty shall say to them, "And I have constituted my king upon Zion, my holy hill," v. 8,—according to the purpose revealed to the ancient prophets which you are endeavoring to confute. The Messiah himself is then to interpose, and recite the decree by which he

is constituted king, and proclaim the universality of his empire, and his conquest of his foes. "I will declare the decree. The Lord hath said unto me: Thou art my Son: this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will give the nations thine inheritance, and the ends of the earth thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron: thou shalt dash them to pieces like a potter's vessel."—Vs. 7-9. Zion is thus to be the seat of his throne; and at the time when he receives his dominion and enters on his reign, the kings of the earth, instead of being his obedient subjects, are to be assembled in array against him, and are to be overwhelmed by his avenging bolts. This is in harmony with the predictions of his coming, Isaiah lxvi. 15, 16, Zech. xiv. 1-4, 12, 13, 2 Thess. i. 1-10 and ii. 8, Rev. vi. 15-17, xi. 18, xix. 19-21, which foreshow that the kings are to be assembled in arms against him, and are to be swept to destruction by his devouring lightnings. The Psalmist now turns, and exhorts the kings and judges of the earth, instead of vainly attempting to exclude Christ from his empire, to bend in submission to his sceptre, and adore and serve him; that they may escape destruction, and share in the blessedness to which those who put their trust in him are to be exalted. "Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him."—Vs. 10-13. This implies, like Isaiah lxvi., Zech. xiv., 2 Thess. i. and ii., and Rev. vi. and xix., that the destruction is to be confined to the open and organized enemies who endeavor to intercept him from his throne, or refuse subjection to his sway; and that those who survive are to be led to welcome and serve him, and to partake in the blessings of his gracious reign. His assumption of the dominion of the earth and the conversion of the nations are, therefore, to take place—not at an antecedent period—but at the time of his second coming.

Psalm cx. presents a similar prediction of the destruction of hostile kings and the conversion of the nations at his assumption of the dominion of the earth. Christ is to sit at the right hand of the Father till his enemies are subdued. "Thus saith Jehovah to my Lord (the Messiah), Sit at my



right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool. The rod of thy strength will Jehovah send forth from Zion. Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies."—Vs. 1, 2. This session at the right hand of Jehovah accords with Daniel vii. 9–14, in which the Ancient of days is exhibited as appearing enthroned at the judgment and destruction of the fourth beast; Rev. vi. 16, in which the Father, that sat on the throne, as well as the Lamb, is represented as appearing to the kings and their armies in the day of his wrath enthroned; and Rev. xxi. 22, 23, xxii. 1–3, in which the Lord God Almighty—the Father—is exhibited as enthroned with the Lamb in the New Jerusalem, and constituting its temple and its light during the millennium of the earth. It is subsequently announced that in the day of his wrath, which is the day of his second coming and judgment of his enemies, he is to smite kings and slaughter many foes. "The Lord at thy right hand—(the Messiah)—smites kings in the day of his wrath. He shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill them with dead bodies, he shall smite heads on the wide earth."—Vs. 5, 6. But that day of vengeance on his enemies is to be the day of the willing and joyful submission of the other inhabitants of the earth to his sceptre. "Thy people are free-will offerings in the day of thy power, in beauties of holiness, from the womb of the morning to thee (thy morning), the dew of thy youth," v. 3: that is, from the first rays, the dawn in freshness and beauty of thy millennial reign. It is at the time of his coming, therefore, the conquest of his armed foes, and establishment of his throne in Zion, that the nations are to be converted, and become the willing and joyous subjects of his sceptre.

His judging and destroying the usurping powers that tyrannize over his people—which are to take place at his second coming—are likewise exhibited in Psalm lxxii. as to be immediately followed by the conversion of the Gentiles, and a reign of peace over the whole earth. The Psalmist first predicts, in the form of prayer, that God will invest the Son with the office of Judge of the earth, which he is to exercise in righteousness,—delivering his people and judging his enemies. "O God, give thy judgments to the king, and thy righteousness to the king's Son," v. 1. This investiture with the dominion of the earth is to take place, we learn from

Psalms ii. and cx., Dan. vii. 9-13, and Rev. xi. 15, at Christ's second coming and destruction of the antichristian hosts. The first great acts of his reign, it is then announced, are to be the deliverance and vindication of his humble and necessitous people, and the destruction of the tyrants who are warring on them. "He shall judge thy people with righteousness, and thy afflicted ones with judgment. He shall judge the afflicted of the people, he shall save the sons of the needy, and *shall crush the oppressor.*"—Vs. 2-4. These judgments are to be immediately followed by the manifestation of himself in his infinite beauty and graciousness, the conversion of the nations, and the extension of his empire over the whole earth. "They shall fear thee with the sun [wherever it shines], and before the moon generation of generations. *He shall come down like rain upon mown grass, and like showers that water the earth.* In his days shall the righteous sprout, and abundance of peace till the moon shall cease. And he shall rule from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. Before him the inhabitants of the wilderness shall bow, and his enemies shall lick the dust. And to him shall all kings bow, all nations shall serve him."—Vs. 5-11. To the conversion of the nations is to succeed an everlasting reign of righteousness, plenty, and bliss. "He will have pity on the poor and needy, and the souls of the needy he will save. From oppression and from violence he shall redeem their soul, and precious shall their blood be in his eyes. Let there be (but) a handful of corn in the land on the top of the mountains; its fruit shall wave like Lebanon, and they shall flourish from the city like grass of the earth. His name shall be forever; his name shall be in the presence of the sun [wherever it shines], and by him shall men bless themselves; all nations shall praise him."—Vs. 13-17. This glorious change is thus to be wrought by the Messiah, at the time of his investiture with the dominion of the earth, and coming to judge and destroy the usurpers who arrogate his throne, and oppress and devour his people.

The next predictions probably in the order of time are those of Isaiah ii. and Micah iv., in which it is foreshown, in the most explicit terms, that in the last days, when Jehovah shall re-establish his temple on Mount Zion, and shall reveal himself there in glory, all the false religions that have before

prevailed, are to be swept from existence, and all nations repair to Jerusalem to offer worship and receive laws:

"It shall come to pass in the last days, the mountain of Jehovah's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; *and all nations shall flow unto it.* And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig-tree, and none shall make afraid; for the mouth of Jehovah of hosts hath spoken it."—Isaiah ii. 1-4, Micah iv. 1-5.

And that is to be when Jehovah comes in visible majesty, and his enemies are to fly to the caverns of the mountains, to hide themselves from his vengeance. Rev. vi. 15-17. "Enter into the rock, and hide thee in the dust, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty."—Isaiah ii. 10. This implies that he is then to appear visibly, with such dazzling displays of his deity as to strike his enemies with consternation. "For the day of Jehovah of hosts shall be upon every one that is lofty, and upon every one lifted up; and he shall be brought low: and the loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of man shall be made low; and Jehovah alone shall be exalted in that day. And they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth."—Vs. 10-19. Why should they fly to the dens and caverns to hide themselves from the splendors of his majesty, if there are to be no signals of his personal presence? Why should they be smitten with terror at his impending vengeance, if—as they maintain who deny that he is then to come in person—that epoch is to be an epoch of mercy exclusively, and not of judgment on his enemies?

At this great crisis, accordingly, he is effectually to vindicate his right to the supreme homage he demands. The

- haughty usurpers who arrogated his throne, and attempted to exclude him from his empire, are to be dashed to destruction, and all nations and individuals led to renounce their false gods, and become his willing adorers. "The lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down; and Jehovah alone shall be exalted in that day: and the idols he shall utterly abolish. In that day a man shall cast his idols of silver, and his idols of gold, which they made each one for himself to worship, to the moles and to the bats; to go into the clefts of the rocks, and into the tops of the ragged rocks, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth."—Vs. 11, 18, 20, 21. The epoch of the renunciation of all false religions, and the conversion of all nations to the worship of Jehovah, is, therefore, the epoch of Christ's second coming in glory, judgment, and destruction of his usurping and incorrigible enemies, and re-establishment of his temple and throne in Jerusalem, at the restoration of his ancient people.

That his coming in glory, and assumption of the empire of the earth, are to take place at the period of the conversion of the nations, is revealed also Isaiah xi. It is when the "Stem of Jesse and Branch out of his roots shall judge the poor with righteousness, reprove with equity for the meek of the earth, and smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and slay the wicked with the breath of his lips," vs. 1-4,—which are acts he is to exert at his second coming: 2 Thess. ii. 8, Rev. xix. 15-21, that he is to stand as a signal to the people, and the Gentiles are to seek to him. "In that day shall the root of Jesse, which stands, be for a signal to the nations,—unto him shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious," v. 10. The era of their conversion is the era, therefore, of his second coming, deliverance of his chosen people, and judgment of his usurping enemies.

There is a similar prediction Isaiah lxvi. It is when "Jehovah shall come with fire, and with his chariots, like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire,—and by fire and by sword he shall plead with all flesh, and his slain shall be many," vs. 15-16; that is, he is to "set his sign among the nations, and declare his glory among the Gentiles," v. 19; and it is from

the restoration of the Israelites, and the creation of the new heavens and the new earth at that time, that "from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, all flesh is to come and worship before him."—Vs. 20-23.

The next predictions of the contemporaneousness of these events are those of Psalms xcvi.-xcix., which were probably written soon after the age of Isaiah and Micah. In Psalm xcvi. the earth is summoned to sing unto Jehovah a new song, and bless his name, to celebrate his salvation, declare his glory among all people, and worship him in the beauty of holiness. The realms of nature are called also to rejoice and exult before him; and the reason is, that "he comes to judge the earth, and shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth; that he reigns, and shall establish the world that it shall not be moved, and shall govern the people in uprightness."—Vs. 10-13.

The xcviith Psalm indicates the mode of his advent, and the means by which he is to destroy his enemies, and announces that it is to be the epoch of Zion's deliverance, and the extinction of all false religions. "The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice, let the multitude of isles be glad. He comes in clouds, and darkness is round about him; a fire goes before him, and burns up his enemies round about. His lightnings lighten the world, the earth beholds and trembles. The hills melt like wax at the presence of Jehovah, at the presence of Jehovah of the whole earth. The heavens declare his righteousness, and all the people see his glory."—Vs. 1-6. The consequence is, that "all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols, are confounded," v. 7: while "Zion hears and is glad, and the daughters of Judah rejoice because of his judgments, by which he preserves his saints, and delivers them out of the hands of the wicked."—Vs. 8-12.

In Psalm xcviith. the Psalmist celebrates the victory of Jehovah over his enemies, and redemption of his people, and again summons the whole earth to rejoice, and make a joyful noise before him, because he comes to judge the earth:

"O sing unto Jehovah a new song, for he has done marvellous things; his right hand and his holy arm have gotten him the vic-

tory. Jehovah has made known his salvation to the eyes of the nations; he has revealed his righteousness [in delivering his people]. He has remembered his mercy and his truth for the house of Israel [and verified his promises of redeeming them from the power of their enemies]: all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God [which he has bestowed on them. Therefore] Shout to Jehovah all the earth. Burst forth and sing and play. Make music to Jehovah with a harp, with a harp and voice of song. With trumpets and sound of cornet, shout before the king Jehovah. Let the sea roar and its fulness; the world and them who dwell upon it. Let the streams clap their hands, and the mountains rejoice together before Jehovah, *because he comes to judge the earth*; he will judge the earth in righteousness, and the nations in uprightness."

These rapt apostrophes to the earth to celebrate the triumph of Jehovah over his enemies, the deliverance of his ancient people, and the institution of his gracious reign over the world, are prophetic, and show that the nations are in fact thus to proclaim and exult in his victory; and, therefore, that their conversion is to take place at the time of his personal coming, and institution of his millennial reign.

The next great predictions in the order of time, Dan. ii. and vii., show in a manner still more direct, that the conversion of the nations is not to take place till Christ's second coming, but is immediately to follow the destruction of the antichristian hosts. Thus in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, Dan. ii., the image representing the four great series of kings, who were to slaughter the nations and persecute the saints of the Most High, stands, till the stone cut out of the mountain without hands—the symbol of the saints who are afterwards to reign over the world—strikes it on the feet, and crushes it to powder; and then the stone becomes a great mountain, and fills the whole earth. The nations are not to be converted, therefore, till the destruction of the powers denoted by the image, and the saints enter on their reign. But the saints who are symbolized by the stone are the risen and glorified saints: and they are not to rise, nor are the powers denoted by the image to be destroyed, till Christ comes and assumes the dominion of the earth. It is at that time, accordingly, that the empire of the saints is to extend over all the world. The conversion of the nations, therefore, is to take place at the period of Christ's second coming.

In like manner, in the vision, chap. vii., it is not till the judgment and death of the fourth beast, whose little horn wears out the saints down to the time of its destruction, that Christ is invested with the dominion of the earth, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him, and the saints of the Most High take the kingdom and possess it for ever. The nations most certainly, therefore, are not to be converted before that period. They are not to be Christianized and sanctified under the rule of the fourth beast and the domination of the apostate church, symbolized by the little horn. And they as certainly are, at that epoch, to be brought to subjection to Christ's sceptre; for the very object of his assuming dominion over them is to bring them to serve him; and then, accordingly, we are assured, "all dominions shall serve and obey him," v. 27, and that epoch is indisputably the epoch of his second advent; for he is then to come in the clouds of heaven, we are here expressly shown: and that is the representation of all the great passages, as we have seen, which describe his second coming, and the destruction of the antichristian hosts that are then to be arrayed against him: as 2 Thess. i. and ii., in which it is foreshown that he is to be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that obey him not, and destroying the Wicked One, the Man of Sin, by the breath of his mouth and the brightness of his coming; Rev. xix. 11-21, in which he is exhibited as descending from heaven with his armies, precipitating the beast and false prophet into the lake of fire, and slaying the kings and their armies; Isaiah lxvi. 15, 16, where it is foretold that he is to come with fire, and his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire, and slay his enemies; and Zech. xiv. 3, 4, in which it is foreshown that he is to descend visibly from heaven, set his feet on Mount Olivet, and fight with the nations that are gathered to the siege of Jerusalem. No point, indeed, in the whole compass of the prophecies is more certain than that he is to come in person and glory in the clouds at the destruction of the powers symbolized by the beast, false prophet, and their armies. To question it, is in effect to question that he is ever to come in the clouds. The assumptions and reasonings which are resorted to to show that he is not to come in person and majesty at that crisis, will prove

with equal effect that he is not to be personally present at the resurrection of the holy dead, 1 Thess. iv. 16; the judgment of the living nations, Matt. xxv. 31, 32; or the resurrection and judgment of the unholy, Rev. xx. 11-15. There is no consistent medium between a blank disbelief of his second appearing, and believing that his coming in the clouds and assumption of the dominion of the earth, are to take place at the destruction of the antichristian powers that now usurp his throne and empire. But it is as unquestionable that that is the epoch of the conversion of the nations, as it is of his coming. Idolatry and antichristianism are to prevail down to the time that he comes in visible glory, and takes vengeance on his enemies, and delivers his chosen people. It is then that the apostate hierarchies and persecuting monarchs are to be swept from the scene; it is then that idols are to be utterly abolished, and their worshippers, casting them to the moles and to the bats, are to go into the clefts of the rocks and into the tops of the ragged rocks, for fear of Jehovah, because of the glory of the majesty with which he will then reveal himself, when he arises to shake terribly the earth. Isaiah ii. 18-21. It is then that the earth is to be filled with the knowledge of Jehovah as the waters cover the sea. It is then, and not till then, that the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, are to be his; and all people, nations, and languages, and all dominions are to serve and obey him.

The same great certainty is revealed, also, Zech. viii. and xiv. It is not until Jehovah returns unto Zion, and dwells again in Jerusalem, and she is called "the City of Truth, and the Mountain of Jehovah of Hosts, the Holy Mountain,"—which is not to be till Christ comes in person to redeem her,—that "many people and strong nations shall come to seek Jehovah of Hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before Jehovah," viii. 3, 22: and it is not till he has descended in person on Mount Olivet, and destroyed the armies that are gathered against Jerusalem, that every one that is left of all the nations to which those armies belonged shall go up from year to year to worship the King Jehovah of Hosts, xiv. 3, 4, 16.

And, finally, the same period is exhibited in the New Tes-



tament as the epoch of their conversion. It is at the era of the seventh trumpet—when he is to raise and judge his saints, and destroy his enemies—that it is proclaimed by voices in heaven that the sovereignty of the world has become the Messiah's, and he shall reign over it for ever and ever. *Rev. xi. 15–18.* It is not till the time of the last judgments on the antichristian kingdoms has come that it is announced that after their infliction all nations shall come and worship before him, because he has manifested his righteousness. *Rev. xv. 3, 4.* It is not till the New Jerusalem has descended from heaven that the nations that survive the destroying judgments with which great Babylon, the beast, and their party have been dashed to destruction, are to walk in the light of that city, and the kings of the earth are to bring their glory and honor into it. *Rev. xxi. 23–26.*

It is thus as clearly revealed that the epoch of Christ's coming is the epoch of the conversion of the nations, as it is that it is to be the epoch of the overthrow of the antichristian powers, the restoration of the Israelites, and the resurrection of the holy dead. The prophets utter but one voice on these subjects, and that resounds through the whole of their predictions, and announces in the most emphatic accents that all these great events belong to the same era.

Such are the numerous, unequivocal, and emphatic proofs that Christ's second coming is to take place anterior to the millennium. There is scarce another subject in the whole range of the Scriptures that is treated more largely, that is presented in a greater variety of aspects and connexions, or that is so interwoven with the great current of contemporaneous events as to place its period beyond all rational dispute. To appreciate the truth and force of the demonstration the long array of passages we have quoted forms, let it be considered, on the one hand, that there is no diversity of opinion in respect to the philological meaning of those of them of which the language is the medium of the prophecy. All the leading translators with whom we are familiar, Cocceius, Vitringa, Lowth, Newcombe, Venema, Hengstenberg, Maurer, Stuart, Alexander, our common version, and a crowd of others, assign them, in every particular that is of moment to the argument, identically the grammatical sense which we have ascribed to them. It is admitted on all

hands that they are Messianic: it is admitted by the most authoritative interpreters of all classes, that they treat of the period of Christ's reign, or the millennium, and of the introduction of that period. The commentary of Maurer, for example, one of the most authoritative of modern Hebraists, assigns to them these characteristics, and his translation gives them the sense for which we contend, with as much clearness and precision as our version or any other. This great fact—as indisputable and conspicuous as the presence of the sun at noonday—settles the question. The philological meaning of those passages is that which we ascribe to them; and they have no other sense. The pretence that their philological is not their prophetic meaning, is as monstrous as presumption and folly ever ventured to utter. Those of the passages that are symbolic, it is also universally admitted, are Messianic, and treat of the period of Christ's coming and reign; and the sense we have attributed to them is as indubitably their true meaning. They foreshow the coming of the Son of God in the clouds, destruction of the antichristian powers, and entrance on his reign here, or they have no prophetic sense whatever. If his second coming is not the theme of these two classes of passages, it is vain to pretend that there are any that foreshow it.

On the other hand, it is to be considered also, that there are no passages which assign Christ's second coming to a different period. Not a solitary intimation can be found, not a syllable exists in the whole range of the Bible that implies that his advent is to take place at another epoch. Its whole testimony on the subject, every hint it breathes in respect to it, concurs in assigning it to the period we have indicated.

The construction we have placed on them is therefore, beyond all reasonable question, the true construction. It is their natural and obvious meaning. It is the sense which the laws of philology and symbols assign to them. It is consistent with all the other teachings of the sacred word. It is obnoxious to no legitimate objection whatever; and can be opposed only on the ground of false principles of interpretation and arbitrary theory.

The denial, however, that this is their true meaning, is embarrassed with insuperable difficulties. There is no law

of language or symbols by which this construction can be set aside, and a different one established in its place. It cannot be denied that Christ's coming is foretold in them, except on grounds that will equally prove that his coming is not predicted anywhere else. Nor is the revelation which is here made reconcilable with God's perfections, if Christ's coming is not to take place at the time and in the form that are here foreshown. Why should he have caused the prophets to predict his coming in such a vast series of passages at that epoch, and in that mode, if the meaning which the predictions naturally bear, according to the established laws of language and symbols, is not their true meaning? If he had designed to reveal a different coming, was it not as easy to define and distinguish its time and mode by the most unequivocal terms and symbols, as to reveal this? And did not the very object of a revelation of it, and his own truth and benignity, require it? The denial that this is the true meaning of the many distinct and independent predictions in which it is made—comprising nearly all that refer to the subject—is a palpable impeachment, therefore, of his veracity and wisdom, as well as a gross violation of his word.

How then is it that the great scheme of the divine government thus revealed in these prophecies is not generally received by the church, but is unhesitatingly, and by many even passionately rejected, and the different system held in its place;—that Christ is never to reign in person on the earth; that his second coming is not to take place till after the millennium has passed; and that then, instead of largely delivering the race from the effects of the fall, and instituting over it a new dispensation, under which it is to exist in much the same state in which it would had it never apostatized—he is to put an end to its multiplication, strike the earth from existence, and appoint the residence of those whom he has redeemed in some other world? These false notions have been inherited by the present generation from its predecessors, and they are the product of a long course of erring teachers and false teachings.

1. One reason that the truth remains concealed from the general eye, and error continues to be accepted in its place, is that altogether mistaken notions prevail respecting the

laws of symbolization. The great law that agents represent agents, acts denote acts, events events, relations relations, and conditions conditions, had never been noticed until pointed out by ourselves; and is still disregarded by a large share of those who attempt the exposition of the symbolic prophecies. Accordingly, as they are without the proper key to the symbols, they have no means of ascertaining their true meaning, and determining what constructions are erroneous, but are left to the guidance of mere whim, conjecture, or at the best probability. Their constructions, consequently, are as unlike and often as absurd, as their prepossessions and fancies are various. How can they be expected to detect and abandon their errors, as long as they adhere to the false theories by which they were led into them? How can it be hoped that they will emerge from the cloud of misapprehensions in which they are involved, as long as they know nothing of the light that can guide them into the sphere of truth? Would they adopt the great laws which have been unfolded in the *Journal*—the accuracy of which is placed beyond disputation—and conscientiously apply them in the interpretation of Daniel and John, they would be carried irresistibly to the reception of the great doctrine of Christ's second coming anterior to the millennium, as one of the most unquestionable and most glorious of the revelations that are made in these prophecies.

2. A second reason of their non-reception of the truth is their inacquaintance with the laws of figurative language. Their views of the principles on which figures are used, are as mistaken as their notions of the office of symbols. Of those laws of the comparison, the metaphor, the hypocras-tasis, the personification, and the allegory, which are of chief importance in interpretation, they have not the slightest knowledge: not a hint of their nature, and the office which they fill, is to be found either in the ordinary systems of rhetoric, the treatises on interpretation, or the current expositions of the Bible. Instead, the idea that generally prevails, is that figures obscure, in place of illustrating the meaning of those who use them; that a passage is figurative is regarded as indicating that its meaning is vague, and to be determined rather by conjecture and fancy, than deduced by indubitable rules. The consequence of this want of dis-

crimination is that they not only run into the greatest errors in interpreting the passages in which figures occur; but that they often imagine they lie couched in expressions in which not a trace of them exists. In thousands of instances, accordingly, they create the meaning out of their own fancies, which they force upon the prophets, and interpretation is made a mere work of perverse ingenuity and lawless imagination. Instead of expounding the revelation God has made, they employ themselves in framing a new one; and being unacquainted with the principles of figures, which would disclose to them their error, they are unable to disentangle themselves from the thralldom of misconceptions in which they become involved.

3. But a still more influential reason of their originating and cherishing false views of the import of these predictions, is that they generally have assumed that the philological meaning of the unsymbolic prophecies is not their true predictive meaning, but is a mere shell that covers an inner and mystical sense, and that that is the sense which it is their office as predictions to convey. The fabrication and evolution of this imaginary sense is what is called *spiritualizing* the prophecies. A more monstrous figment was never devised by human presumption and folly, nor employed with such effect to empty the sacred word of its true meaning, and make it the mere vehicle of whatever false and absurd teachings the dreamy, the lawless, and their reverent, wish to promulgate under the sanction of divine authority. It has been the instrument from age to age, as the caprice, the party interests, or the impiety of men dictated, of fastening on the Scriptures, sometimes the most false and atheistic philosophies, sometimes the most anti-evangelical doctrines, and sometimes the most debasing superstitions and corrupt morals. The grand office for which it is at present employed is first, to wrench all their true meaning from the prophecies which foreshow the destruction of the apostate and persecuting powers at the time of Christ's second coming, his reign on the earth during the millennium, the resurrection of the saints at his coming, and reign with him during the thousand years, the restoration and conversion of the Israelites and the conversion of the Gentiles universally at the same great epoch, the final redemption of the race from

all the evils introduced by the fall, and its everlasting continuance here in a condition much like that which it would have enjoyed had Adam not apostatized; and next to convert the prophecies of these events into mere predictions that *religion is to be diffused throughout the world by human instrumentality*, and the nations in a considerable proportion sanctified during a literal thousand years, and that then, after a fresh apostasy for a short period, Christ is to come and annihilate the earth, arrest the multiplication of the race, raise and judge the dead, and transport them to other worlds which are thereafter to be their eternal residence. Not that the other doctrines are not specifically presented in the passages which we allege as teaching them; not that this fabricated system is directly presented in them, or in any others of the sacred word; but on the pretext that those other teachings are a mere *shell* or *envelope*, in which this *spiritual system* is inclosed. Thus the Israelites in the prophecies which foretell their restoration are held by these spiritualists to be a *shell* in which the Gentiles are enveloped, and made the real and sole subject of the events predicted respecting the people of Israel. Zion and Jerusalem are held to be a *shell* in which the Christian church lies couched, like a bird in the egg, from which it is to be hatched; and the restoration of the Israelites is a shell in which the *spiritual* meaning enveloped is the conversion of the Gentiles. The grand prerogative of the interpreter accordingly is, in the judgment of these dreamers, to break these fancied shells, and educe the new fledged birds that are to emerge from them! Was there ever a more unscholarly, absurd, and audacious piece of quackery got up by men who profess to be proficient in sacred and scientific learning? Did reputable writers ever before attempt to play a game, betraying such a wretched debasement of intellect; or a spirit so abhorrent to reverential piety, so utterly at war with the laws of language, and so fatal to all certainty of the true meaning of the word of God? It is surely time that men of sense and integrity were ashamed of this wretched course, which in any other sphere of life would consign its advocates and fosterers to universal contempt and reprobation. It is time that the word of God was wrested from the hands

of such lawless perverters, and interpreted by the proper laws of its language and its symbols.

There can be no hope that these parties will come to a true knowledge of the prophecies while they continue to be enthralled by this miserable system. Its very business is to set aside what God has revealed, and substitute a fiction in its place. It fills, in the sphere that is assigned it, precisely the office which "the intuitional consciousness" of the modern rejecters of the fact and possibility of a book revelation, fills in regard to the Bible generally. It is as audacious an arrogation of the place of the great Revealer, as bold a rejection of his word, as thoroughly rationalistic in its principle, as that; and has proved scarcely less deadly to true piety: for it was under the auspices of the daring usurpation of authority over the word of God which it assumes, that nearly all the great errors gained their entrance into the church that have blighted and wasted it from the days of Origen to the present time.

4. The unfortunate treatment of the prophetic Scriptures by those who have attempted to expound them, is another reason that many either continue to adhere to the spiritualizing theory of construction, or dismiss them altogether from consideration. That the prophecies have been most unhappily treated by a crowd of writers is indisputable. But why has it been? Simply because, like the spiritualists—to which class, indeed, most of them belong—they have not entered into any careful inquiry into the laws of symbols and figurative language; they have not had any just views of the principles on which they are used, but have been governed, in their interpretations, by fancy, caprice, false theories of the plan of God's government, or the interests of party. But is that a just reason for continuing that method of perverting the sacred word? Is it not an imperative reason that it should be abandoned, and the Bible interpreted by its proper laws? The fact that men have long misunderstood and misrepresented the prophecies does not divest them of their authority; it does not annihilate the obligation to study them, and receive their genuine teachings. The fact that great numbers who have attempted to unfold them have missed their true meaning and run into wild and fantastic

errors, is no proof that their prophetic sense cannot be ascertained and is not easily determinable. Did the fact that the church had for ages rejected the great doctrines of redemption, and substituted a monstrous system of error and superstition in their place, release the men of the age of the Reformation from obligation to ascertain what the true doctrines of the Bible are, or render the discovery and demonstration of those doctrines in any measure so difficult as to justify their neglect of them, and continued adherence to the enormities of Romanism? No more does the ill success of a crowd of expositors, who either had no principle at all to guide them in their constructions, or only a false one, furnish any justification of the prejudice and distaste with which, by great numbers, the prophetic Scriptures are regarded, and the obstinate determination with which every attempt to lead them to a knowledge of their teachings is repelled.

With some, however, the subject has become so distasteful that they even congratulate themselves that they have never been betrayed into the folly of attempting its investigation; and deserted of the Spirit of God, and left to the blindness which the contempt of his truth draws after it, they seem totally unconscious that their pride has its basis in an impeachment of God's wisdom in making the revelations which are the objects of this neglect and scorn. Such a spirit will never lead to the knowledge of the truth, nor be led to it. It must be expelled from the breast by a new creating and all-subduing power, before a possibility can exist, even when they are presented to the eye, of a filial reception of the great designs which God has foreshown in his word. Instead of thus proudly congratulating themselves that they are wiser than God, how much more becoming it were to kneel at his feet with a broken heart, and earnestly invoke the aids of his Spirit in a humble and resolute endeavor to ascertain what it is that he has revealed, and called us to study receive and believe, and to persevere in the inquiry till he grants the light that is needed, and verifies the great promise in which he assures a blessing to those who read and keep the words of his prophecies!

5. A fifth reason of the continued rejection of the great things taught in these prophecies is the false views that are entertained of the great aims of the Divine government.



There is a large class of theologians who assume, as a sort of self-evident truth, that the administration God is now exercising over the world is the administration, in all its great characters, that he is to exercise in all future time. As, therefore, but a small portion of the race are now made partakers of salvation, they infer that but a moderate portion of future generations are to be sanctified, or at most with the exception of a short period compared with the six thousand years that have already passed; and thence they assume that the great object of God's government is not to deliver the race from the curse of the apostasy, but, instead, to make a display of the evils of sin. They believe, accordingly, that the great bulk of the posterity of Adam are to perish, and that only such a number—but a fraction compared with the whole—are to be redeemed, as will serve to show that God is gracious, and has all the attributes that are requisite to accomplish a work of redemption. They, consequently, do not look hereafter for any essentially better condition of the world than the present. Some of them do not believe there is to be any millennium whatever; and others hold that it is to continue but a thousand years, and suppose it is to be nothing more than a considerable improvement of the present state of the nations. At the end of that period they maintain that the number of the race is to reach its completion, the earth itself be struck from existence, and the redeemed as well as the lost have their subsequent abode in another world. This preposterous theory, for which not a syllable of authority exists in the word of God, is an effectual barrier, while it retains dominion over their minds, to the reception of the truth. Their principles, indeed, make them averse to such a redemption of the world through infinite ages as God contemplates. They turn from it with positive distaste and disgust. They have brooded over the idea that God's grand object in calling the race into existence is to display, first his sovereignty in leaving them to fall, and then his justice in their punishment, and that the final perdition of much such a proportion of the whole number that is brought into existence as appears now to perish, is essential to his glory and the well being of his general kingdom, that they persuade themselves *benevolence* requires that they should acquiesce in and choose this scheme in preference to

any other. They, accordingly, do not wish any greater extension of the work of redemption. The idea of a conversion of all nations; of their perfect deliverance at length from the curse of the fall, and continuance here, in a series of generations through eternal ages, in unspotted sanctitude and bliss, is revolting to their thoughts. They regard it as detracting from God's glory, which they imagine lies almost exclusively in inflicting punishment on the guilty. We have known not a few who have carried this feeling to such a length that they averred they were themselves willing to be damned if it would contribute to God's glory. These are, indeed, extreme cases; yet the views of a large portion of the church are little less mistaken, and little less perverting in the influence they exert. They are so occupied with the false notion that God's great object in giving existence to the race is to display his wrath at sin, and that that is designed mainly for the instruction and impression of *other orders of beings*,—not to prepare the way for the speedy repeal of the curse on man himself, and his conversion and maintenance here in righteousness and blessedness for ever; and the false notion that he is soon to reach the limit of his multiplication, and be swept from the scene, and thence that the largest portion of the race is to perish, that it proves an insuperable barrier to their reception of the true teachings of the sacred word on the subject. No room is left by their theory for the supposition of any other system. The assurance given in many passages of the prophets, that men are to subsist on the earth, and multiply for ever; that the curse of want, sorrow, tears, and death, is soon to be repealed, the earth made a paradise and the scene of Christ's visible presence and reign; and that all nations are to be converted, and go on through interminable ages in sanctitude and happiness, is, accordingly, considered as amounting to nothing more than that there is to be a more general prevalence of the gospel, and elevation of the race to a better state during a comparatively short period. To receive these in their true import, were to abandon their *a priori* speculations respecting the final aims of God's government. The prophecies are, consequently, kept out of sight, depreciated as obscure and enigmatical, and if studied are subjected to the spiritualizing process, by which they can be charged with any meaning that is desired, and

made the vehicles of announcing those very systems by which all their genuine teachings are denied and perverted.

No amendment of these parties can be expected while they continue under the sway of these unwarrantable notions. Would they, however, dismiss the *à priori* speculations in which they in effect determine beforehand what course God must pursue, and impartially endeavor to ascertain what it is which the Bible teaches on the subject, and receive that as its true meaning which its language and symbols express, they would find it impossible not to see that the great scheme of administration which it unfolds is identically that which their theories now reject with so much dislike. They would then take the revelation made Daniel vii. 11-14, 28, that at the epoch of the destruction of the wild beast Christ is to come in the clouds of heaven, receive dominion over all people, nations, and languages, that they should serve him, and continue his sway over them for ever, as foreshowing precisely what it declares;—that he is then to come in the clouds of our world, be invested with the dominion of the earth, bring all nations to submission to his sceptre, and reign over his kingdom here,—which it is expressly declared is to be commensurate with the *earth* “under the whole heaven,” not in some other sphere,—throughout eternal ages. To deny that that is what the prophecy foreshows would be as impossible as it would to deny that it treats at all of Christ's coming, investiture with a dominion, and government of a kingdom. In like manner they would thus regard the announcement, Rev. xxi. 2-9, that the New Jerusalem—which is the symbol of the Lamb's wife, the risen and glorified saints—is to come down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband, and that it is to be “the tabernacle of God with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, their God; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away;” as teaching what it declares as plainly as language can express it, that the saints denoted by the Lamb's wife are to descend to reside on the earth; that God himself is, at that period, to dwell with men on the earth, and that they are to be his people; that they are

then to be freed from the curse of pain, toil, sorrow, tears, and death, brought on the race by the fall, and are, therefore, to be placed in a condition much like that in which they would have existed had the first pair not apostatized. Now, however blinded by their *à priori* speculations, as unscriptural and lawless as those of Strauss or Baur, perverted and filled with a positive dislike of such a redemption of the race, these gracious revelations of the great purposes of mercy are emptied of all their meaning, and fall on their ear with as little impression as so many unintelligible sounds,—are repelled, scorned, and detested, as though they were but the gibberish of a drivelling idiot. There is no theme the suggestion of which so readily excites their resentful passions; there is none on which they are so prompt to lavish their reproaches and scorn.

6. Unworthy notions of the nature of Christ's visible reign, should he establish his throne on the earth, are another reason for the rejection of these predictions. There are not a few who suppose, if Christ is to come and reign here as a king, he must descend to a level with the present monarchs of the nations, indulge a similar pomp, and be surrounded by a similar crowd of vain, hypocritical, and degraded sycophants and menials! Rejecting the revelation he has made, that he is to come to destroy those corrupt classes, and raise the race universally from the dominion of sin, and from its curse, sorrow, suffering and death, they assume that the world would continue, if under his personal sway, essentially the same as it is now,—a vale of sin and sorrow, a vast theatre of unsanctified passion, coarse debasement, and lawless outrage—an immense aggregation of corrupt cities and worn out states, with their array of almshouses, hospitals, penitentiaries, and labor prisons; and that to preside over such a disordered and polluted scene, were unworthy of his dignity and sanctitude. So utterly blinded and infatuated are they by their preconceptions, that they cannot believe, though the voice of Christ himself proclaim it, that his scheme of procedure can be any other than their degraded fancies ascribe to him. They are not disposed, therefore, to listen to what he says on the subject. They are too sure of their own infallibility to think that they stand in any need of instruction from him. That the

object of his coming and reign on the earth, is to deliver the race from the degradation and misery to which it is now sunk ; that his scheme contemplates the absolute repeal at length of the curse of the fall ; that the generations who come into being during the millennium are to be freed from death, suffering, want, and sorrow ; and raised to a beauty of righteousness, wisdom, and bliss, worthy of adopted children who live in his immediate presence ; that his presence and the great measures of his administration springing from it are indispensable means to the accomplishment of this change in their condition and character ; that it will be an infinite blessing and glory to the race to be brought into such a relation to him ; that it will be immeasurably honorable and blissful to the risen saints to reign with him, and find a theatre for the employment of their exalted powers in the instruction and rule of the nations under his sway ; that such an administration, in which the world is to be raised to a holiness and blessedness worthy of his immediate kingdom, and the work of redemption continued through eternal years, is alone worthy of Christ's perfections, the greatness of his sacrifice, and the vastness of his empire that is to be affected by it ; this does not come within the sweep of their thoughts ; it is not conceivable on the ground of their *a priori* speculations ; it is as incompatible with their tastes, as the purity and wisdom of the angelic world are with their narrowness and perverseness ; as the grandeur of the divine attributes is with the nothingness of theirs. This, indeed, bespeaks a sad debasement of views. One would think that to all who feel any interest in the subject, it would naturally be regarded as peculiarly favorable to the sanctification and well-being of the race that Christ is to reign over them here in person ; and that the assurance from the word of God itself, that the world is to be so changed as to be a fit scene of his visible presence, and the residence of his glorified saints ; and that those who are then still in the natural life, will be sanctified, and made eminently blessed, would remove all disbelief on the subject and command their unhesitating assent. These parties, however, think it would involve an immeasurable degradation of Christ, and prove a sad obstacle to the well-being of his kingdom ; and they choose, therefore, to reject and denounce

it, and substitute a scheme of their own invention in its place, and claim for it the sanction of his authority.

7. Low and degrading notions of what the condition of the world is to be during the millennium, are another reason of the continued rejection of these views. There are crowds who suppose the state of the race during the millennium is to be essentially what it now is, except that the nations generally are to become Christianized, and a larger proportion enter the church, and unite in its benevolent agencies. There are many in the ministry, we do not doubt, whose ideas of that period would be amply verified, if the whole population of the globe were only raised to a state of culture, respect for religion, and worldly prosperity, equal to that of their own congregations and the communities in which they live. Of anything beyond that, they have not the shadow of a conception. Instead, indeed, of regarding the present condition of the race in respect to its weakness, exposure to want, pain, sorrow, decay and death, and the temptations which they involve, as the consequence of sin, there are many who hold that this is its natural condition; that these evils spring necessarily from the constitution with which man was originally endowed, and would have reigned over him, though in less distressful forms, had he never transgressed; they maintain, indeed, that death is not merely a natural event to man, precisely as it is to brutes, but that in place of a curse, the most degrading and ignominious that can be inflicted on a moral being, it is a benevolent allotment, designed to usher him into a higher state of existence. Hence they hold that to deliver the race from that infliction, and make them immortal in their present bodies, no matter how changed they may be in nature, nor how the earth may be changed by a new creation to fit it for the residence of such immortals—would be an immeasurable curse instead of a blessing. They are, accordingly, enamored of disease, decay, and death. Its frightful ghastliness, and the horrors of dissolution in the grave, become, to their fancies, forms of glowing beauty. Like maniacs who conceive that the dark cells in which they are confined, are gorgeous palaces, the pallets of straw on which they sit are thrones, their fetters badges of royalty, and their keepers liveried attendants, these bewildered spiritualists, who often

flatter themselves that their doctrines are the doctrines of natural science, persuade themselves that the curse with which they are smitten for their sins, is a blessing; the frown of the Almighty that blasts one half of their nature, and consigns it to ignominy and ruin, is a smile of love; and that the hideous disgrace with which they are branded, is a symbol of glory. These parties, of course, do not receive the revelation God has made that contradicts what they call their *natural* religion. The announcement on the page of inspiration that the time is at hand, when death, the great penalty of revolt, is no longer to be inflicted on the race; that at Christ's coming the believers then living are to be changed from mortal to immortal; that all who are thereafter sanctified through the vast series of ages denoted by the millennium are also to exchange their mortal for immortality, and death be unknown till the revolt which is to follow that period; and that all the other elements of the curse also, toil, pain, want, sorrow, tears, are to pass away, and all things become new—these gracious announcements are passed by unheeded, esteemed as but idle words, or wrested by the process of spiritualization from their meaning, and made the vehicle of a foreign and false sense. The thought that their children, or their children's children, should thus be snatched from the agonies, the blight, the ignominy of death, and the dishonors of the grave, and raised to the beauty, and dignity of immortal youth, unspotted sanctitude, and unmingled bliss, fills them with distaste; and like delirious lepers who become possessed with the idea that the loathsome disease under which they are sinking, invests them with a supernatural grace and majesty, they come positively to love the debasing curse with which their being is cankered, and prefer ghastliness to beauty, death to immortal life, perdition to redemption.

Let not the reader imagine that this is an exaggerated representation. It is but a faint picture, we believe, of the amazing debasement, the shocking blindness and perversion that reign in the minds of vast crowds in the church. Why else is it that the great doctrine of the redemption of the generations that are to come into existence after Christ's second advent, from the curse of the fall, proclaimed so clearly and emphatically in the sacred word, is received by them with a

grin of unbelief, a shout of derision, or a flush often of impatience and anger? Why else is it that the great fact taught everywhere in the Bible, that want, painful toil, sorrow, and death are the curse of sin, is boldly rejected by them, and the doctrine, graven everywhere in characters of light on the sacred page, that deliverance from this curse is one of the great gifts purchased by Christ, and to be bestowed on those whom he redeems, denounced by them as a contradiction to the laws of our *nature*, and as confuted by the discoveries of *natural science*?

8. Another influential reason for the continued rejection of these views, is the false notion that prevails respecting the agency the church is to exert in the conversion of the nations and introduction of the millennial state. The current doctrine is, that that change is to be wrought through the instrumentality of men, as absolutely as the instruction and conversion of those who are now saved generally are; and by the use of the same means. It is held accordingly, that the various associations that have been formed for communicating the gospel to men, and are now acting in their several spheres for that end, are in fact to be the instruments of Christianizing the whole world and introducing the millennial age. This notion, which is maintained by many with the utmost assurance, has, on the one hand, led crowds to the idea that to contribute according to their ability to these societies is not only a duty, but is the highest and most acceptable service that they can render to God; and on the other, it has opened a wide theatre in the offices, agencies, and celebrations of those institutions, for the gratification of vanity, pride, love of conspicuity, and ambition of influence; and created to a large class in whom these passions reign, a strong wish for the continuance of the church under the persuasion that it is by these agencies that the world is to be redeemed. Their importance results almost entirely from their place in these organizations. Their main hopes of gratifying their love of display, of notoriety, and of power, depend on the unrelaxed activity of these institutions; and hence they contemplate with extreme dislike and hostility the doctrine that it is not by them, though highly useful, that the world is to be converted and the millennium introduced; that they are inade-



quate to that end, because they are inadequate to the new creation of the heavens and earth; to the resurrection of the holy dead; to the binding of Satan; to the repeal of the great curse of want, misery, and death, brought on the race by the fall; and above all to the renovation of the heart;—and they denounce it accordingly with a zeal and bitterness that are equal to the vanity and ambition with which they are animated. As they imagine that if a belief in Christ's premillennial advent should prevail, it would overcloud their favorite schemes of distinction, they are led to view it with aversion; to seek for reasons to fortify themselves in antimillenarianism, and to give it a continued hold on the faith of the church.

Sad as this picture is, the observation of a long period, and a pretty intimate knowledge of the parties who have been active in endeavoring to arrest the spread of the doctrine of Christ's premillennial coming, and the means they have employed to keep the church in its present belief, leave us under no doubt that a large share of the hostility manifested to the doctrines we maintain, has its origin in this sinister feeling. It is mixed, indeed, in the minds of many, with better sentiments. Thousands undoubtedly are betrayed by the false teachings they receive, into the belief that their views are right, and that in rejecting and denouncing the doctrine of Christ's coming and reign on the earth, they are doing God service. But whatever the extent may be to which that persuasion prevails, it is notorious that in the main the zealous, noisy, and unscrupulous assailants of the doctrine, are of the class we have described. Let a list be made of the aspiring, intriguing, and unscrupulous, who are aiming at higher places, endeavoring to form or control a party, make themselves of consequence to the great societies, and display themselves at anniversaries, or who have some other sinister end to gain; and it will be found that it contains the names of most of the hot-headed opponents of Christ's millennial reign. Let a list be made, on the other hand, of the ablest, the most cultivated, the noblest minded, the most conscientious, and the most enlightened and attached friends to the great doctrines of the gospel, and there will not be found among them a single violent rejecter, and denouncer of the doctrine. There will be many who do

not receive it. There will be some who think it obnoxious to very serious objections. But the great body of them, and those of the very highest rank in intellect, learning, candor, and piety, will be found to be persons who, instead of discarding the subject, regard it as having high claims to their consideration; who have a profound feeling that the current views are perplexed with the most grave difficulties; and who are disposed to receive with impartiality, discussions that aim to ascertain what the true principles are on which the prophetic Scriptures are to be interpreted, and to set aside by legitimate criticism the erroneous notions that prevail; and who welcome in a friendly and generous spirit every useful contribution that is made to a just understanding of the subject. The coarse, passionate, and abusive opposers of the doctrine and its advocates are not found among them. A descent must be made from the elevation they occupy, to reach the murky region where vanity, party spirit, intrigue, and an unsanctified ambition reign. It is there where something else than truth has predominant sway, that the flippant, captious, insolent, and unscrupulous assailants of the doctrine are found. It is there where cabals are formed; where schemes are devised to maintain the reign of error; and where arrangements are made by which the agencies instituted for the propagation of the gospel—not for its perversion and suppression—are employed to diffuse misrepresentation, to awaken and foster prejudice, to dupe the unsuspecting, to alarm the timid, and use all the means with which the artful and aspiring are familiar, to intercept the truth from the eyes of God's people; and mainly from the fear that if the truth prevail, their favorite hopes will be disappointed; that no adequate theatre will be left for the display of their virtues; that they shall lose the positions, the flatteries, the honors, the influence they now enjoy or anticipate. Were the current of opinion to turn, so that precisely the opposite course were requisite to their popularity, they would undoubtedly, as soon as they discovered it, wheel and denounce with equal zeal what they now applaud, and applaud what they now condemn.

9. Another obstacle to the reception of the truth, is the fear of being thought enthusiastic and fanatical. There are many whose prejudices have reached such a height, that

they regard it as incompatible with good sense and sobriety, to study the prophetic Scriptures; they, in effect, set aside the whole of that part of the word of God as beneath their notice; they look with disdain and contempt on those who attempt to understand it, and congratulate themselves that they have not fallen into such a discreditable weakness and folly. This feeling, which is essentially the same as that with which Newman, Parker, and their school, who deny the possibility of a written revelation, discard the whole of the inspired volume, is an insuperable barrier to their discerning and receiving the truth. Repelled as beneath their dignity, the object of scorn and derision, they place themselves out of the sphere of its influence; they close all the avenues through which it may find entrance to their minds, and debar themselves also from the aids of the Holy Spirit; for it is by the infusion of *the light of his truth* into the mind, that he illuminates and quickens it. They accordingly who hate and spurn that word—abandoned by him usually to their delusions—are left to carry their unbelief and hostility to their natural results, and meet their appropriate reward. How many thousands there are, who, by this wretched fanaticism, are binding themselves fast in the manacles of error, and fostering in their people one of the worst forms of infidelity, because disguised under a pretence of good taste, prudence, and even piety, and thus leading them blindfold into the perils of the last great conflict, in which their ignorance, prejudice, and false faith, may prove the occasion of their destruction.

10. Another obstacle to the reception of the great teachings of the sacred word on this subject, is a reluctance to make the mental effort that is necessary to master the principles of interpretation, apply them to the prophecies, and follow them out in their relations to the views they now entertain. This, if we may judge from avowals we have heard, and opinions that have been expressed to us, is one of the most efficient reasons with a large number that they continue to regard the subject with distaste, and dismiss it from consideration. It certainly reflects very little credit on their sense of obligation, or their love of truth, and implies an estimate of their powers which, if hinted by others, would be little likely to meet their acquiescence. But it is

founded on a total misjudgment of the subject, as well as of themselves. It requires no extraordinary effort to master the principles of interpretation, or to apply them to at least a large share of the prophecies. There is nothing peculiarly intricate in them; while those branches of the subject, such as the principles of analogy, and the laws of figurative language, which require the nicest scrutiny and the most delicate discrimination, are in themselves eminently attractive, and adapted in a higher measure than any other to sharpen the intellect, develop and quicken the refined sensibilities, and unfold and give truth and elegance to the taste; and this is precisely the discipline which these persons need, under which their powers would be stimulated and matured, and the acquisition and contemplation of the truth become easy, purifying, and exhilarating.

Such are the principal reasons, we believe, that the great teachings of the Scriptures on this subject continue to be rejected and neglected by such numbers. They are anti-millenarians, not that they have any express authority in the word of God for their faith on the subject; not that they are able to vindicate it as an inference from the teachings of the Scriptures; not that they are able to give a satisfactory answer to the numerous proofs from the prophets that Christ is speedily to come and reign on the earth; but simply because they have inherited their notions on the question from their teachers, and because they have been made averse by preconceptions, dislikes, personal and party interests, and other sinister influences, to the opposite views. We appeal to such of our readers as have in a measure, in connexion with our labors, been led to the reception of the doctrine of Christ's coming and reign anterior to the thousand years, whether such were not the causes, in a great measure, by which they before were withheld from the study and adoption of the true teachings of the Scriptures on the subject. We appeal to those who still continue anti-millenarians, whether it is not under the sway, in a large degree at least, of the reasons we have enumerated, that they are led to discard them, and continue their adherence to their present faith. If such be the fact, we need not apprise them that the course they are pursuing is not such as becomes the dis-

ciples of Christ. We need not remind them that it will not meet approval at the bar of Jehovah.

Those who have been led by the distinguishing merey of God to the knowledge and reception of the truth on this subject, should derive from these considerations encouragement to proclaim the great doctrine of Christ's coming and reign with boldness, and endeavor to lead those who are placed within their access, to lay aside their prejudices and study and embrace it. No body of Christ's disciples ever had more ample means to demonstrate the truth of their views, or opponents whose opinions were more wholly devoid of scriptural authority. There is not an element of anti-millenarianism that is not the work of error and unbelief, and may not be demolished by the most direct testimony from the prophetic word. And no duty, we believe, is more important than the proclamation now is of this branch of the faith once delivered to the saints, by those in the ministry who hold it. It has been by many too much neglected from an unwillingness to disturb the faith of their people, or a fear of reproach. But that course is as impolitic, we believe, in respect to their reputation and influence, as it is inconsistent with their fidelity to the truth. A very considerable number of ministers in different parts of the country have, within two or three years, preached the doctrine of Christ's coming and reign, the resurrection and reign with him of the saints, the renovation of the earth, the conversion of the nations, the repeal of the curse of death, and the perpetuity of his kingdom here, and in every instance, we believe, with benefit to their people and themselves. Instead of disgusting, they have awakened the interest of their congregations; they have disarmed prejudice, conquered ignorance and aversion, led many to the reception of the truth, and gradually overcome the objections, and won the confidence of their associates in the sacred office, and prepared the way for the unobstructed dissemination of the truth; while in several cases the seal of heaven has been set on their labors by the outpouring on their congregations of the influences of the Holy Spirit. Such we doubt not will in all instances be the result of a faithful, bold, and thorough treatment of the subject; and we believe the time has come

when it cannot be omitted without a dereliction of duty that is incompatible with the character of the witnesses of Jesus.

---

ART. II.—THE SYNOD OF DORT.\*

BY THE REV. ENOCH POND, D.D.

THE doctrines of the Reformers had penetrated into the Low Countries as early as the year 1521. The way had been in some measure prepared for them by the labors of Erasmus, who was a native of Rotterdam, and who preceded Luther by several years. Although the Emperor Charles V. did his utmost to extirpate the growing heresy, it continued to spread in all directions, and multitudes declared themselves in its favor. Philip, the son and successor of Charles, was even more violent than his father in his efforts to stay the progress of truth, and support the sinking cause of Rome. He augmented the number of the bishops, enacted the most severe and barbarous laws against all innovators in matters of religion, and created that inhuman tribunal, the Inquisition, to intimidate and subdue, if possible, the manly spirit of an oppressed and persecuted people. But his measures were as unsuccessful as they were absurd. His furious and intemperate zeal for the superstitions of Rome tended only to accelerate their destruction. The Papal authority, which had only been in a critical state, was reduced to a desperate one by the very steps that were designed to support it. The nobility formed themselves into an association in the year 1566, with a view to procure the repeal of Philip's tyrannical edicts; but their solicitations and requests being treated with contempt, they resolved to obtain

---

\* The Articles of the Synod of Dort, with the history of events which made way for that Synod, as published by authority of the States General of Holland. Translated from the Latin with Notes, Remarks, and References, by Thomas Scott, Rector of Aston Sanford, Bucks: London, 1818.

by force what they hoped to have gained from clemency and justice. They addressed themselves to a free and an abused people, spurned the authority of a cruel yoke, and with an impetuosity and vehemence that were sometimes excessive, trampled upon the rites and institutions of the church of Rome. To quell these tumults a powerful army was sent from Spain, under the command of the Duke of Alva, whose sanguinary proceedings and horrid barbarity kindled that long and bloody war which terminated in the republican independence of the United Provinces. It was the heroic conduct of William, Prince of Orange, seconded by assistance from England and France, that delivered these Provinces from the Spanish yoke. This valiant Prince fell by the hand of an assassin, A. D. 1584. His murderer confessed that he was instigated to destroy him by the Jesuits, who "assured him that if he died in the attempt he should be placed among the martyrs."

The confession of faith of the Low Countries, commonly called the *Belgic Confession*, was published in the year 1563. It accords with the confessions of the other reformed churches, establishing the Presbyterian form of government, and embracing all those points of doctrine which have usually been denominated Calvinistic. It was afterwards confirmed by several Synods, and by repeated acts of the states. Other sects were tolerated, not excepting the Papists, so that there was really more Christian liberty in Holland than in any other country of Europe; but the *established* religion was that of the reformed churches, as set forth in the confession to which we have referred. Great harmony prevailed in these churches, from the time of their establishment till the close of the sixteenth century, when attempts were first made to disturb their peace, by certain proselytes from Popery; but these were easily repressed by the Provincial Synods.

A more formidable assault was now to be made, the circumstances of which we shall briefly detail. Our principal authority is the history before us, which was drawn up and published by the authority and under the sanction of the States General and the Prince of Orange, as well as of the Synod of Dort itself, and refers, in every part, to the public records of the transactions in question. We have consulted

also, and compared, at every step, Brandt's History of the Reformation in the Low Countries, Hale's and Balcanquall's Letters and Expresses concerning the Synod of Dort, together with such other sources of information as could be obtained, and as seemed to be necessary.

James Hermanson (commonly called Arminius) was born at Oudewater, in Holland, in the year 1560. At the age of fifteen, while at school at Marburg, his native town was pillaged by the Spaniards, and his mother, sisters, brothers, and the greater part of the inhabitants, were inhumanly slain. From Marburg he went to Leyden, and passed through the university then recently established at that place. We next find him at Geneva, attending the lectures of Theodore Beza; and then at Basle, where he was offered a doctorate in theology, at the early age of twenty-two. He left Switzerland for Italy, from which country he returned after a few months, under the unfounded imputation of having abjured the reformed religion, and become a Papist. He was settled in the ministry at Amsterdam in the year 1588, in which situation he continued for the next fifteen years.

During his ministry at Amsterdam, the religious views of Arminius underwent an important change. While preparing to refute a work in opposition to the then commonly received doctrine of predestination, he became a convert to the views he was intending to expose, and carried them even further than the author he was examining. He renounced the doctrine of absolute decrees, of particular election and atonement, and of irresistible grace, and held that none are chosen to eternal life but in consequence of foreseen faith and holiness. This change in his sentiments excited attention and opposition; but by prudent management, and the concurring authority of the magistrates, he was enabled to retain his place.

In the year 1603 Arminius was appointed to succeed the learned Junius as Professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden. This appointment was opposed by many of the clergy on account of the suspicions which rested upon him as to the soundness of his faith; but having abjured the errors with which he was charged, and "*promised that he would teach nothing which differed from the received doctrine of the churches*," he was admitted to the professorship." So



much in earnest was he at this time, to clear himself of the suspicion of heresy, that he is said to have defended, in his public disputations, the principal articles of the Calvinistic faith.\*

He had not been long, however, in his new employment, when it was ascertained "that he privately attacked some of the essential doctrines of the reformed churches, cast doubt upon them, and rendered them suspected by his scholars." His learning and eloquence procured him converts among the Belgic pastors and students; but this excited, as might have been supposed, the displeasure of some of his brethren. Application was first made privately to Arminius to state his objections to the received doctrines in a friendly conference; but he declined the proposal. A complaint was then preferred by the Classis of Dort to the Synod of the province of South Holland. To escape from this, Arminius procured a testimonial from some of his colleagues, in which it was declared, "that indeed more things were disputed among the students than was agreeable to them; but that among the professors there was no dissension in respect to fundamentals." The Synod, however, were not to be deceived. They required that the professors should *publicly disavow the opinions imputed to them*, and that all the pastors should testify their consent in doctrine, by subscribing the received confession and catechism.

As this requirement was not fulfilled, the opposers of Arminius petitioned the States General to convene a National Synod, for the purpose of composing religious differences. To this the States General agreed, declaring, however, that *some* of that body wished to add, as the condition of such an assembly, that "there should be a *revision of the established confession and catechism*," a clause indicating the conviction of those who supported it, that the symbols of the church needed revising, and that the new opinions were not consonant to established doctrines. A convention was held preparatory to the proposed National Synod; but the sentiments of the respective partisans were so opposed to

---

\* This he did contrary to his own opinions, as John Corvinus, one of his followers, confesses. See Scott, p. 18.

each other that nothing could be done. In this convention Arminius and his followers were requested, "with the strongest *obtestation*," to state to the other professors and pastors their objections to the confession and catechism; a promise being added that they would endeavor fully to satisfy them, and that nothing to their disadvantage should be communicated beyond the place where they then were assembled; but Arminius could not be induced to comply with this request.

Having failed in this first attempt to obtain a national synod, the project of a provincial synod of the churches of North and South Holland, was next resorted to. To avoid this Arminius petitioned the States General that cognizance should be taken of his cause by the *lay counsellors* of the supreme court. His request was granted; and a conference between him and Gomarus, his colleague and principal opposer, was accordingly held in presence of the council. The result was a report to the States General that "the controversy between the two professors was not of much importance, but regarded some subtle disputes about predestination, which might be safely merged in a mutual toleration."

Both parties, however, continued to pursue their respective plans as before; the Arminians refusing to state their objections to the received doctrines of the church, and endeavoring to avoid or postpone all ecclesiastical assemblies for the discussion of disputed points, while the opposite party were as earnestly striving to bring the matter to a decision.

In the year 1608 Arminius found himself compelled to state his opinions.\* This he did at considerable length, in his famous *Declaratio* before the states of Holland. He made a similar statement in a second conference with Gomarus, in the convention of the States General, early in the following year. At this time he complained of ill health, and in October, 1609, he died.

The disputes which he had originated in the Belgic

---

\* In the Synod of South Holland, held in 1608, Arminius and his followers were enjoined to make known their objections to the received doctrines within the space of one month, "under penalty of incurring the ecclesiastical censure against the contumacious." It was to escape this censure that he published, soon after, his *Declaratio* before the States.

churches did not, however, die with him. They continued to be agitated with unabated violence. The followers of Arminius, when their leader had been drawn from his concealment, and had consented to make a public declaration of his views, became exceedingly bold and open in their objections to the established faith. They are represented as "defaming the received doctrines with horrible calumnies, and as raging furiously (*debacchari*) against them."

In the year 1610, the leading Arminians entered into a formal *confederacy*, and thus became an organized body. It was at this time that they presented to the States of Holland their celebrated *remonstrance*, from which they were afterwards called *Remonstrants*. This remonstrance contained their objections to the received doctrines, under five heads, commonly called the five points of Calvinism; also an exhibition of their own views, in five articles, often referred to in the subsequent parts of this controversy. They succeeded in procuring an injunction from the States of Holland that nothing further should be enjoined upon theological students, relating to the subjects of predestination and grace, than what was expressed in the articles of their remonstrance.

Emboldened by the magistrates, many of whom were understood to favor their cause, the Remonstrants now proceeded to acts of violence. To quote from the history before us, "They labored assiduously, with all their powers, that the pastors, who especially resisted their attempts, should be not only ejected from their churches, but banished from the cities; and that on all the churches which were without pastors, even when reluctant and struggling against it, those should be obtruded, who were addicted to their own opinions; all others being excluded wherever they were able, though lawfully sought out and called by the churches."

In some places, persons under the influence of the Remonstrants—those lovers of toleration—had recourse to arms. The lawful magistrates were compelled to resign; and pastors of churches were not only deposed, but driven out of the cities. In this way, Cornelius Gezelius, one of the ministers of Rotterdam, was deprived of his ministry, and banished from the city by the victors.

In the year 1613, another conference was held at Delft, in hope of accommodating existing differences; but nothing effectual was accomplished. The Remonstrants were violent for toleration, insisting that the points in dispute were of small importance, and might be mutually overlooked.\* To promote the object which they had in view, a formula of toleration was drawn up, and the attempt was made to *compel* subscription to it by force of law. A decree in favor of toleration was passed in the States of Holland, which the pastors were "*commanded* to obey without any contradiction." And that they might the more easily prefer those who were attached to their party to the ministry of the churches, they effected another decree, taking the choice of pastor, in great measure, from the church, and putting it into the hands of the civil power. It is painful to add that the learned Grotius, at this time Pensionary of Rotterdam, was a principal instrument in these violent measures, and afterwards published an apology for them.

The attempt to impose pastors upon the churches by the power of the magistrate, was followed, as might have been expected, with division and strife. The churches refused, in most instances, to receive such pastors, separations ensued, and the separatists were severely persecuted. And when these godly men—oppressed with fines, prisons, and banishment—appealed to the supreme court for relief, and the senators of the supreme court attempted to succor them, the Remonstrants obtained, through the advocate of Holland (Barneveldt), that an interdict should be laid on the court from protecting them.

In the year 1617, the necessity for a national synod began to be generally felt and acknowledged. It was earnestly recommended by the Prince of Orange, and by several foreign princes, particularly by James I. of England. It was as earnestly opposed, however, by the Remonstrants, who, when they found that by no persuasion or management they should be able to prevent it, had the madness to

---

\* At other times, they represented these points as of very great importance; affirming that the views of their opponents "subverted the gospel, hindered the ministry of the word, and overturned the foundations not only of the Christian religion, but of all religion."

excite the people to arms. "The rulers of some cities, having formed a conspiracy, decreed to levy soldiers, who should be bound by oath, neither to the States General nor to the Prince of Orange, but to themselves alone, for the defence of the cause of the Remonstrants, and of their own authority. This was done at Utrecht, at Haerlem, at Leyden, at Rotterdam, at Gouda, at Horn, and in other places; the Remonstrants instigating the rulers of the cities to this, as may be clearly proved by divers of their letters, which afterwards came into the hands of the States." Grotius and Hoogerbeets were at Utrecht, endeavoring to excite the people, and put the city in a posture of defence, when the Prince of Orange came against it. He succeeded in taking it, and these two men were sent to prison, where Barneveldt was already confined.

These events only served to show more clearly the necessity of a national synod, and to hasten its approach. Accordingly it was decreed that the synod should be holden at Dordrecht (Dort) in November, 1618.

At this celebrated synod—the only one approximating to the character of a general synod of the reformed churches—there were delegates present, not only from the united provinces, but from the churches of England, Scotland, Hesse, Bremen, Switzerland, and the Palatinate. The foreign divines present were twenty-eight; those of the United Provinces were thirty-six, besides five professors and twenty elders. The synod was organized November 13, and continued by adjournments until May 29, having held in all 180 sessions. John Bogerman was moderator, and Sebastian Damman and Festus Hommius secretaries. Commissioners of the States were present at all the sessions, of whom Daniel Heinsius was secretary. The following oath was taken by all the members: "I promise before God, in whom I believe and whom I worship, as being present in this place, and as being the searcher of hearts, that during the course of affairs in this synod, which will examine and decide, not only the five points, and all the difficulties resulting from them, but also any other doctrine, I will use no human writing, but only *the word of God*, which is an infallible rule of faith. And during all these discussions, I will aim alone at the glory of God, the peace of the church, and

especially the preservation of purity of doctrine. Thus help me, my Saviour Jesus Christ: I beseech him to assist me with his Holy Spirit."

Soon after the commencement of the sessions, thirteen of the principal Remonstrant divines were summoned to appear, and defend their cause before the synod. While waiting for these, the synod took measures for a new translation of the Bible into the Dutch language, and discussed other important subjects, such as the baptizing and catechizing of children.

On the 6th of December, the Remonstrants who had been summoned, appeared in the assembly. They protested against the authority of the synod, and refused to acknowledge its members as their judges. Their protest was overruled by the foreign divines, and they were required to prepare for their examination and defence. After much debate respecting the *order* of considering the disputed subjects—the Remonstrants wishing to commence the discussion by examining and refuting the sentiments of their adversaries, but their judges deciding that they must first explain and prove their own doctrines, and neither party being disposed to yield—on the 14th of January, 1619, the Remonstrants were dismissed from the assembly. The question of their dismissal was submitted to the foreign divines, and by them was decided in the affirmative. They had liberty, however, to transmit in writing whatever they pleased, with a view to explain or defend their doctrines—a liberty of which they largely availed themselves.\*

In the absence of the Remonstrants, the synod proceeded to gather their sentiments from their papers and books, and to judge of them from what they had published. The business now proceeded with as much harmony, perhaps, as was consistent with a full liberty of thought and remark, and with as much dispatch as could be expected, considering the manner in which things were done. At length, the several

---

\* February 7, the Remonstrants presented to the synod a manuscript in defence of their first and second articles, consisting of 204 sheets. February 15, they presented another, explaining their third, fourth, and fifth articles, consisting of 60 sheets. February 25, they presented a third, consisting of 80 sheets. March 19, they presented a fourth, consisting of 333 sheets. Assuredly, they had no great reason to complain of the want of a hearing.

articles of the Remonstrants were examined and refuted, the canons of the synod were prepared, and on the 23d of April were subscribed by all the members. The sentence passed upon the Remonstrants, by which they were "deprived of their ministerial and academical functions," was not acted upon by the foreign divines, as they would not be seen passing sentence upon the subjects of another State.

By request of the civilians present—the Commissioners of the States—the synod went into an examination of the confession and catechism of the Belgic churches; and both symbols, so far as relates to doctrine, were unanimously approved. When these things were done, the foreign divines took their leave; after which the synod continued to meet for several weeks, to transact business of a more private nature. The sessions closed, as before stated, May 29, 1619.

The points of difference between the Remonstrants and Calvinists, on which the synod of Dort adjudicated, were the Divine predestination, the extent of man's redemption by the death of Christ, the nature of human corruption and of conversion to God, and the perseverance of the saints. It is not our intention to give an extended view of the sentiments held by the contending parties touching these points. We shall merely state, and that in the briefest manner, the leading opinions asserted by the synod.

The decree of election is affirmed to be *absolute*, that is, not conditioned on foreseen faith and holiness, and *the fruits* of election, such as repentance, faith, love to God, and obedience to his commandments, the only ground on which it can be assumed. The preterition or reprobation of the non-elect is also distinctly acknowledged. The atonement of Christ is said to be universal as to its sufficiency, though limited in its saving application. On the ground of it, all are sincerely invited to come to Christ. They are commanded to repent and believe the gospel. The unbelief of men is declared to proceed from their own fault. Faith and repentance, which are the gifts of God, are bestowed on the elect, and on them only; and yet the grace of the Divine Spirit, in imparting these gifts, does not operate in a violent or compulsory manner, but in strict accordance with the nature of man, illuminating the understanding, and effectually inclining the will. Also true believers are said to be

preserved by the power of God, through faith unto eternal life.

At the close of each of the preceding articles is annexed a condemnation of the opposite errors, comprising the substance of the Socinian and Pelagian heresies.

The synod solemnly renounced those absurd and impious consequences, which were so commonly urged against the doctrines which they had unfolded, and earnestly exhorted the pastors under their authority to adhere closely to the sentiments and language of Scripture, and carefully avoid every expression which might appear to exceed the limits of its genuine meaning.

Respecting these articles of the synod, the venerable Thomas Scott observes: "Fewer things appear to me to be unscriptural in them, than in almost any human composition which I have read upon the subject." Again he says: "The doctrines of Scriptural Christianity are here so stated and explained, as to coincide with the strictest practical views of our holy religion; and so as greatly to encourage and promote genuine holiness, considered in its most expanded nature, and in its effects upon all our tempers, affections, words, and actions, in relation to God and to all mankind." Mr. Scott further speaks of the "holy, guarded, and reverential manner in which the divines of this reprobated synod stated and explained the doctrines of the gospel, compared with the superficial, incautious, and often unholy and presumptuous manner of too many of the present day."

Perhaps no religious convocation has been so perpetually traduced, and has suffered so much from the misrepresentation of enemies, as the Synod of Dort. We have an instance of this in the gross perversion of its articles, under the name of an abridgment, by Daniel Tilenus. This pretended abridgment was copied by Heylin, and by him sent abroad to do its mischief, in all parts of the earth. We will not copy this miserable paper; but we will give the brief but pointed testimony of Mr. Scott in regard to it: "I have long been aware," says this venerable man, "that there is no new thing under the sun; that speaking all manner of evil falsely of the disciples of Christ is no exception to this rule; and that misrepresentation and slandering the men



called Calvinists has been very general, ever since that term was invented. But I own that *I never before met with so gross, so barefaced, and inexcusable a misrepresentation as this, in all my studies of modern controversy. It can only be equalled by the false testimony borne against Jesus and his Apostles,*" by their enemies, as recorded "in holy writ."

Other instances, not at all more justifiable, might be easily adduced. Without stopping to refute the slanderous insinuation of Brandt, that some of the members of the synod were frequently intoxicated with Rhenish wine; how often is it represented that the synod was convened by a mere faction, and with a view to gratify the spleen of Maurice, Prince of Orange. In reply to this, Mr. Scott remarks as follows: "It seems undeniable that it had become the general and almost universal opinion of the different States in the confederated provinces, that such a national synod as the Calvinists had always urgently requested was absolutely needful; and that the Remonstrants and their party could no longer resist this prevailing sentiment. Indeed, nothing can be more clear, than that all parties, except the zealous Remonstrants, regarded a national synod as the proper and only effectual way of terminating the religious disturbances; a method, not only sanctioned by the example of Christians in every age, but enjoined by God himself."

The members of the synod, it has been said, "were actuated only by the spirit of *theological hatred and contention*;" and hence "their opinions are deserving only of contempt and reprobation." "Now this," says the London Christian Observer, "is so far from being true, that we think no candid person, whatever may be his sentiments on the controverted points, can fail of doing justice to the apparent piety and holiness which characterize all their proceedings. Even allowing them to be erroneous, there seems to be no just ground for accusing them of inveterate malice. It was perfectly natural that the Belgic pastors should be alarmed at the progress of opinions which threatened to overturn their whole system of ecclesiastical discipline, as well as of religious doctrine, and that they should conscientiously endeavor to resist and suppress them."

It has been represented that not a few of the foreign members were dissatisfied with the proceedings of the synod, and

regretted exceedingly that they had been there. One of them in particular is quoted as exclaiming, "O Dort! Dort! would to God I had never seen thee!" The individual reported to have used these words was Martinijus of Bremen,—a man who occasioned no little trouble in the synod, and whom Brandt claimed as "a downright Arminian." He kept up a secret intercourse with the Remonstrants during the sessions, and was evidently more in their interest than in that of the brethren with whom he was associated. The declaration of the excellent Bishop Hall, one of the deputies from England, has not been so frequently quoted as that of Martinijus. Upon leaving the synod before its close (which he was obliged to do on account of the state of his health) he said, "There is no place upon the earth so like heaven as the Synod of Dort, and none where I should be more willing to dwell."\*

It is intimated by Goodwin, in his "Redemption Redeemed," that the members of the Synod of Dort were bound by a secret oath, before entering on their work, to condemn the Remonstrants. But this slanderous accusation, Bishop Hall, when far advanced in life, indignantly repelled, declaring that no oath was ever taken by the members, or required of them, except that which we have given on a previous page.

Among other things charged to the synod are the imprisonment of Grotius and Hoogerbeets, and the execution of Barneveldt. But all these men were imprisoned before the assembling of the synod, and their arrest and sentence were occasioned rather by *political* than religious considerations. We do not mean to say that they were not concerned in the religious disputes of the day, or that political measures growing out of these disputes may not have been the means of their overthrow. The fact is, they were in a different party of the State to the Prince of Orange. He regarded them as in a conspiracy against the government of the Provinces, and as laboring to excite the people to rebellion. Hence his desire to take them out of the way. How far they were guilty of all that was alleged against them we pretend not to say. At any rate the Synod of Dort, which did not

---

\* Brandt characteristically insinuates that "under *pretence* of indisposition Hall cunningly got away."

convene until months after their arrest, could have had no concern in their imprisonment.

The reasons why this synod has been misrepresented and slandered in the manner here pointed out, are not difficult to be conceived. In the first place, it is no new thing for the cause of God and truth to be reproached and slandered by the world. And more especially is this to be expected when the servants of God furnish some occasion (as in this instance we think they did) to their enemies to speak reproachfully. In the heated, excited state of feeling existing among the clergy of the United Provinces at the time of the synod, it was scarcely possible that they should meet and discuss points of difference in a perfectly unexceptionable manner. Things, it might be expected, would be said and done which would not bear the scrutiny of impartial eyes at the distance of more than two centuries from the scene of action. That such things were said and done in the Synod of Dort we shall by no means deny. In most instances, however, they are to be attributed to a few heated individuals, rather than to the whole body; or they are to be resolved into the spirit and customs of the age, and cannot be fairly judged by the standard of the nineteenth century. Such as they are, however, they have furnished occasion to liberalists and infidels, in every succeeding generation and in almost every part of the world, to cast reproach upon the synod and its measures.

It will be evident to all who carefully examine the articles of the synod, that *too much* is attempted in them. As a formula of faith to be authoritatively enjoined, they go too much into the *minutiae* of doctrine, and into explanations which might more properly be left to the direction of individuals. As Mr. Scott remarks, "The very exactness and particularity into which Scriptural doctrine is branched out and errors reprobated, powerfully counteracted the intended effect, and more than anything else, or all things combined, tended to bring upon the synod such decided but unmerited reproach and odium."

Another thing which brought reproach on the synod was the rigorous treatment with which its decisions were followed up by the civil power. The sentence of the synod merely deprived the Remonstrants of their ministerial and academical functions until they should renounce their errors and be

willing to return to the faith of the church. But on their refusing to desist from the labors of the ministry, they were ordered, by the authority of the States, into immediate exile. Their assemblies were suppressed; and in some instances, when found assembled in disobedience to the laws, they were dispersed by force of arms, and their leaders punished with fines and imprisonment. It is painful to record proceedings so disgraceful as these, and so abhorrent to the spirit of the gospel. They are not, indeed, directly chargeable upon the synod; and they were but a retribution upon the Remonstrants of the same treatment which they began to visit upon the Calvinists before the synod was convened. Still, they were disgraceful to their authors, and offensive in the sight of God, and have been seized upon by the enemies of religion, and made the occasion of reproach.

The reproach which has fallen upon the Synod of Dort may be accounted for, in part, from the fact that so many men of learning and influence,—historians, philosophers, statesmen, professors, such as Grotius, Vossius, Bertius, Episcopius, Le Clerc, Brandt, Limborch, Casaubon, Heylin, &c., &c.,—were strongly enlisted on the side of its adversaries. Men such as these would be able to bring reproach upon any cause to which they were decidedly and conscientiously opposed; while the weight of their names has given currency and influence to their works, and carried them to almost every part of the earth.

To all this it must be added, that soon after the suppression of Arminianism in Holland, the established clergy began to dispute among themselves. These were the Cocceians, the Voetians, the Roellians, the Veschorists, and the Hattemists,—followers of different leaders whose names are now almost forgotten, but who created not a little disturbance in the age in which they lived, and withdrew attention from the efforts of those who were misrepresenting and defaming their brethren before the world.

With a few remarks on the character and tendency of those errors which the Synod of Dort was convened to examine, this discussion will be concluded.

It is not at all likely that Arminius ever disclosed very publicly all his objections to the established religion of his country. The disclosures which he made were literally

wrung from him; and in all probability they were not more full than the necessity of the case required. He showed himself capable of concealing his sentiments at the time of his accepting the professorship at Leyden; and similar evasions were charged upon him to the end of his life. He was publicly declared to have departed from the doctrines of his church, not only on the *five points*, so called, but in respect to "justification, original sin, the providence of God, the inspiration of Scripture, the perfection of man in this life, the assurance of salvation, and some other subjects," and to teach differently in private from what he did in public. In his *Declaratio* he affirms, that on the point of justification he is "not conscious of having thought or said anything different from what the reformed churches believe," and that he is "ready to subscribe with his own hand" to the sentiments of Calvin on the subject. But in a conference previously held before the counsellors of the supreme court, Gomar "produced a writing of his, in which he asserts that in the justification of man before God the righteousness of Christ is not imputed, but that *faith itself*, or the *act of believing*, by the gracious acceptance of God, is that righteousness by which we are justified."

Dr. Maclaine, the translator of Mosheim, who certainly had no prejudices against Arminius, expresses the following opinion with regard to his religious sentiments: "It is a common opinion that the Arminians who flourished before the Synod of Dort were much more sound in their opinions and strict in their morals than those who lived afterwards; that Arminius himself only rejected the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute decrees, and what he took for its immediate consequences, adopting in all other points the doctrines received in the reformed churches; but that his disciples, and especially Episcopius, had totally transgressed the bounds that had been set by their master, and gone over to the Pelagians, and even to the Socinians. Such, I say, is the opinion commonly entertained concerning this matter. But it appears evident to me that *Arminius himself had laid the plan of that theological system which, in after times, was embraced by his followers; that he had instilled the main principles of it into their minds; and that these latter, and especially Episcopius, did really no more than bring this plan to a*

greater degree of perfection, and propagate, with more courage and perspicuity, the doctrines it contained."

But we are not now so directly concerned with Arminius as with his survivors and followers, whose views were canvassed and censured in the Synod of Dort. It is often said that their departure from the established faith was limited to the five points insisted on in their remonstrance to the States. But there is evidence conclusive that such was not the fact. For example, a toleration was offered them in 1611, "provided *they would renounce the errors of Socinianism*;" but they refused to accept it on these terms. Again, they might have secured a toleration in 1613, provided they would give assurances "that *they thought differently from the reformed churches on no other heads of doctrine except the five articles contained in their remonstrance.*" But such assurances they refused to give. Here is evidence conclusive that they had other objections to the established faith besides those they had avowed to the States. Another proof to the same point is their promotion of Vorstius to the theological chair at Leyden, made vacant by the death of Arminius. Vorstius certainly was a concealed Unitarian, and confessed himself to be so near the close of life.

The result of the speculations of Arminius and his followers is full of instruction to the church. The beginnings of error, like those of strife, are "as when one letteth out water." The stream may be small and scarcely visible at first, but it increases as it runs, and its course is ever downwards. Arminius commenced with questioning the received doctrine of predestination. Pleased with his new discoveries he ventured on to other topics. He was uniformly backward to disclose his peculiar sentiments; and most of the points which he *publicly avowed* would not be considered by many of the orthodox of this day as essentially erroneous. It is not at all likely, however, that he ever unfolded himself fully, except to his pupils and particular friends. His disciples were more bold and decided than their master, and pursued their speculations to much greater lengths. In instances not a few, those who began their course Arminians ended it in Socinianism or infidelity. So true is the maxim of the great apostle of the Gentiles, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump."

On the death of Maurice, Prince of Orange, and the accession of his brother in 1625, the Remonstrant exiles were recalled and restored to favor. They established congregations in various places, and founded a seminary at Amsterdam, for the education of young men for the ministry. As a sect, however, the Arminians have never been numerous. They have prevailed chiefly by mingling with other sects, corrupting their churches, and without a change of name or form, bringing them over to their views. In this way the originally Calvinistic church of England became Arminian, under the administration of Archbishop Laud. The churches of Switzerland, of France, and of Scotland have not fared much better. Even the Puritan churches of New England did not wholly escape. The error was brought here from the parent country more than a century ago, and silently infected many of the churches of the Pilgrims.

Arminianism has assumed a variable character, not only in its outward form, but in its internal, practical influence. In the hands of Wesley and his followers, it is warm, stirring, arousing, and effective. It has awakened many from the sleep of sin, and brought them to hope and trust in the Saviour. But in other hands the same general system (if it can be called the same) is cold, formal, heartless, inoperative. It incorporates easily with the world, sets itself in opposition to the doctrines of grace and revivals of religion, and is perpetually running down into Socinianism and infidelity.

---

ART. III.—THE GOVERNMENT OF GOD VINDICATED FROM  
DR. BEECHER'S ACCUSATIONS.\*

BY THE EDITOR.

IN our former article on Dr. Beecher's Conflict of Ages, we treated first, of some of the doctrines of his theory which

---

\* The Conflict of Ages, or the Great Debate on the Moral Relations of God and Man, by Edward Beecher, D.D. Boston: Phillips, Samson & Co., 1853.

he has but partially developed, and that seem to indicate that he is but imperfectly aware of the ground on which he proceeds; and next, of its want of proof, of its contradictoriness to the Scriptures, of its unadaptedness to the end for which he employs it, and of the accusations which it casts upon God.

III. We shall now proceed to show that the assumption on which he predicates the necessity of his hypothesis of pre-existence—that on the supposition that man commences his being in this life, the divine administration over him is un-benevolent and unjust—is a most causeless and injurious impeachment of God's procedure. Dr. B. maintains, it will be recollected, that—

"The principles of honor and of right . . . demand that God shall give to all new-created beings original constitutions, healthy and well-balanced, and tending decidedly and *effectually* towards good. To make them either neutral, or with constitutions tending to sin, would be *utterly inconsistent with the honor and justice of God, and would involve him in the guilt and dishonor of sin*. Moreover, God is bound to place new created things [beings] in such circumstances that there shall be an overbalance of influences and tendencies on the side of holiness, and not of sin. Such are the conceded demands of the principles of equity and honor."—P. 214.

"If in the original constitution of any new created mind, and entirely independent of his knowledge, desire, choice, or agency, there is that which is really sinful (if the idea were not absurd, and the supposition were possible), and if he had no power to do good, and thus secure eternal life, such a creature would not be treated by the Creator according to the dictates of honor and right, nor would he be responsible for the sin so existing; for he would not be its author, but God, and for it God would be responsible.

"Still further: if in the original constitution of a new created mind, anterior to his choice or action, there is a radical derangement or corruption, resulting in a powerful tendency or propensity to sin, certain to result in ruin, whilst at the same time God had the power to create it without this derangement or corruption, so that its natural and proper development would tend towards eternal life, then such a mind is not dealt with rightfully and honorably.

"He does not and cannot decide with what constitutional powers he shall exist. And yet nothing more vitally affects his prospects for eternity. If his original constitution is such that it naturally tends towards evil with great power, and thus creates a moral cer-



tainty of ruin, then existence is to him no blessing, but a curse; nor has the Creator dealt honorably or benevolently by him."—Pp. 36, 37.

Yet God, he holds—on the supposition that this life is man's first existence—has brought him into being in this condition of "radical derangement or corruption, resulting in a powerful tendency or propensity to sin," that is "certain to issue in ruin;" and that God, therefore, has not dealt "rightfully and honorably" by him, and consequently that man is "not responsible for the sin" which he exerts, but God. On the supposition that this is man's first existence, he asserts that—

"The actual facts of this world and of revelation are such that they logically lead us to the result that the present system is indefensible, and that God does not deserve the honor, reverence, and worship of his creatures."—P. 217.

This is truly an awful accusation of God; for as Dr. B.'s theory of pre-existence is demonstrably not true, and if it were, could not exempt the divine administration in the slightest degree from the objection which he urges against it, it follows, if his views are correct respecting the dictates of justice and the condition of man's nature, that man is not culpably an offender against God's law, but that God himself is alone blamable for his sin, and consequently that the whole government of the Most High is infinitely unjust; and thence that the work of redemption is no such work of grace as it is represented in the word of God; that it cannot, therefore, unless by the grossest delusion, be accepted as such; and if accepted, cannot be relied on. For if the imputation to men of sin, and their condemnation on account of it, is altogether false, who can tell but that the promise of deliverance from its penalty may prove to be an equal deception and mockery?

What the element is in the present condition of the human mind resulting from its fall, that on the supposition that this is its first existence, exempts it in such a manner from responsibility for its sins, Dr. B. does not clearly define. Much which he says implies that he regards it as that state generally which is expressed in the orthodox confessions in

the doctrine of the fall and of depravity. If it is that condition, however, it is absurd to imagine that it does not form as complete an exculpation of men, on the supposition that they fell here, as it would had their fall taken place in a pre-existent state. For if it exempts men from the obligation to obey, or from the guilt of sin, it must be because of what it is; that is, because it involves or constitutes a physical disability which releases from obligation, precisely as the loss of a limb or a faculty releases from the obligation to exercise it. But if the very possibility of obedience, so far as the faculties of the mind are concerned, and thence the basis of obligation, are in that manner swept away, the mind is manifestly as completely released by it from all responsibility for its sins, if it is the result of a fall in this life, as it would be if it were the consequence of a fall in a pre-existent one. To assert that it is not, is to assert that what is held to be an absolute disqualification for the responsibilities of a moral agent, is in fact not a disqualification for them. If the present state of the mind induced by its fall, can in any circumstances exempt it from responsibility for its sins, and transfer the blame of them wholly to God, why does it not work that effect as naturally and necessarily, if it was induced by a fall in this life, as it could were it the result of a fall in a previous existence? If the loss of one's eyes, by destroying the possibility, extinguishes the obligation to see, what can be more contradictory and absurd, than to maintain that their extinction at this present time does not as effectually annihilate the obligation, as it would had it taken place at any previous period? In maintaining this view of the present state of the mind, Dr. B., accordingly, completely precludes himself from the result which he attempts to gain by his theory of pre-existence; for if that state releases men from responsibility for their sins, it releases them as effectually, if it was produced by a fall in a previous life, as it could if it were the work of a fall in this.

From some of the most important positions, however, which Dr. B. advances, respecting the nature of man, "the limitation of divine power," and the gradual steps by which the most wise, benevolent, and energetic administration God can exercise, must rise to efficiency over him, his views of man, both in his fallen and unfallen state, differ, we take it, very

essentially from those of the orthodox generally; and render it quite mistaken to regard his profession of the latter as corroborating their truth, or yielding them any authority. Instead of regarding a tendency to sin as having had its origin, as the orthodox doctrine affirms, in the fall, he holds that it is an original and necessary element of the mind anterior to its fall; and of such strength, and lying in such a measure beyond the sphere of the divine influence, as to make it impossible to God, with all the resources of his power and wisdom, to counteract it, and preserve the mind from apostasy. Thus he maintains—

“That there is a temporary limitation of divine power, originating from the limitation of finite capacities to comprehend God and his ways, and a consequent liability in the first generations of creatures, to unbelief, distrust, and sin, involving a season of suffering in God, and requiring a full unfolding of truth in act, until God and his system shall be fully disclosed, and the occasion of unbelief cease,” p. 475. “A temporary limitation of divine power in the earlier stages of creation, in consequence of the liability of finite minds to unbelief and distrust of God, *when exposed to the trials which inevitably pertain to an infinite system, and which are necessary to their own development and perfection*,” p. 509.

“The position that *God’s power of disclosing himself, and his system, and plans, to his creatures in their earliest generations is limited*, does not diminish, but increases our ideas of the greatness of God; for his greatness is the cause of the limitation in question. It is merely the inability of an infinite mind to bring itself and its plans down to the level of a finite mind. Does it exalt our ideas of God, and show the infinite difference between him and a creature, to assert that he can put himself and all his plans fully into the mind of that creature? Or does it, on the other hand, most exalt God to say that he is so vast that no created mind can fully comprehend him or his plans, and that it is beyond even his power to destroy the infinite chasm that separates creator and creature? But simple and obvious as is this idea of the vastness of God and his system, and this consequent limitation of finite minds, and obvious and satisfactory as is the solution of the origin of evil which it furnishes, still it has been much overlooked. The causes which have blinded so many to it are, the inconsiderate ascription to God of the unproved ability to do all things in a moral system by naked power, without moral and intellectual motives; want of proper reflection on the disproportion between him and created minds, and on what is essential in order to

act with him in a universal system, and on the discipline needed to fit created minds for it, and on the trial involved in such discipline; on the ease with which a being so vast, in the execution of his plans which are infinite and for eternity, may be misunderstood, and on the immediate and fatal effects of a loss of confidence in God. It has not been sufficiently considered, that if the very greatness of God, and the necessary limitation of all, even the highest created minds, render it impossible for him to disclose fully either himself or his plans to them, then that he must try them by acting in view of what *he* sees, not of what they see; that is, he must act in view of considerations unseen and unknown to created minds. He dwells in light to which no created mind can approach, and no eye has seen, or ever will see, but in an infinitely small degree, all that is involved in the full knowledge of God. But when once these things are well considered, they disclose a satisfactory reason for the origin of evil, and one not dishonorable to God; for to annihilate the infinite distance between himself and a creature is not in his power. He must act according to his own greatness, and yet under the limitations created by an utter impossibility of transmitting into a finite mind a full knowledge of all that exists in an infinite one. Hence, if he will act with finite minds, on an infinite plan, he must act, at least in the earlier generations, with a necessary liability of being misunderstood; and if his ways are trying, of losing the confidence of those with whom he acts."—Pp. 476, 477. .

It is apparent thus, if this representation is true, that the tendency to sin, so far from having had its origin in the fall, results of necessity from the very nature of new created agents, and has a predominating power in the earliest stages of a moral system. That this tendency is supposed to spring from an incapacity to comprehend all the thoughts and purposes of God, does not alter its character or intercept it from accomplishing the ruin of those in whom it exists. It is as insuperable by the power of God, and as certainly works the destruction of its subjects, as though it were the consequence of an eager appetite, or of a violent temptation from without. His notion, thus, is, that new created beings fell for precisely the same reason as he holds that they now sin after they have fallen; namely, because of a liability and tendency to unbelief, distrust, and aversion, excited by the nature of the trials to which they are necessarily subjected in order to secure the ends of the divine government. This

idea of man's independence of God, or intractableness under the most powerful influence he is able to exert, and invincible tendency to sin by the force of his constitution while unfallen, is thus altogether at war with the doctrine of the orthodox which Dr. B. professes to entertain, and with the teachings of the Scriptures.

Another element of the theory on which he proceeds of equal importance, is the doctrine that God is bound in justice and goodness to exempt his creatures, both fallen and unfallen, as far as possible, from every instance and measure of temptation; and employ all the means in his power to preserve them from sin. He says:—

“Not only do the demands of honor and right forbid the Creator thus to injure his creature in his original constitution, but they equally forbid him to place him in circumstances needlessly unfavorable to right conduct, and a proper development of his powers.

“What benevolent being, dealing with new created minds committed to his care, would not feel bound to place them under a system of influences *most favorably arranged for their highest good*, and where all needless trials and temptations to sin and ruin would be avoided? Could any man defend himself on any principles of benevolence, honor, or right, if he did not act on this principle? And when the great Creator is deciding on the circumstances of the new created immortal minds called into being by his power, is it benevolent, honorable, or right for him to act on any other principle?

“If now, in opposition to these views, any allege that God, for his own happiness or glory, or that of his creatures, may act on other principles, it is enough to say, as before, that it is not supposable that a perfect being could be made happy or glorious by acting on any other principles. The only grounds on which God or any of his holy creatures can be happy or glorious, as honorable and benevolent minds, in view of the ruin of any others, are those already stated. It must appear that God did not wrong them in their original constitution, but gave them a constitution honorably manifesting his sincere good will towards them as individuals, and tending towards eternal life. It must also appear that he did not wrong them in their situation and circumstances, but so placed them that all things were, on the whole, as favorably arranged for all as possible.”—Pp. 37, 38.

He thus holds that God is bound by honor and benevo-

lence to use all the means in his power, in every instance and in every condition, to prevent new created intelligences from falling, and that to subject them, for any reason, to temptations that may be avoided, is infinitely malevolent.

The main elements of his theory of God and man thus are, 1. That new created intelligences have, from the necessary limitations of their capacities, a powerful proclivity to distrust in God and apostasy from him. 2. That God has, as their creator, but very inadequate means of influencing them; and is not able, with all the resources of his omnipotence and wisdom, to preserve them from rebellion. And 3d. That he is, nevertheless, bound in honor and justice to do all in his power to prevent them from sin, and cannot, without immeasurable injustice and malevolence, either subject them, or suffer them to be subjected by others, to any temptations to evil that might be avoided. And it is on these grounds that he maintains, that if this is their first existence, men are not fairly dealt by; but that the condition in which they come into being is the work of immeasurable injustice and malignity; that their subjection to a vast share of the temptations of life proceeds from the same malevolence; and that the blame of their sins, consequently, instead of being theirs, belongs wholly to God.

The whole basis on which he founds the hypothesis it is his object to establish in his volume, is thus altogether artificial, at war with the Divine perfections, and contradictory to the Scriptures, and to our consciousness. His deity is an essentially different being from the Jehovah of the Bible; his new created moral agents are wholly different from the Adam and Eve who were the head of our race; and the moral administration which his notion of justice and honor would dictate is of a totally different cast from that which the Most High is exercising over men. If his views express the truth, nothing can be more certain than that God is unequal to the station which he fills, and to the work he has attempted to accomplish; that his character is infinitely unlike that which is ascribed to him in the Scriptures; and that his government, instead of truth, righteousness, and benignity, is marked, in an awful degree, with the dark hues of a malevolent tyranny, a cruel and devouring despotism. Whether his views are true or false, therefore, is a question

of infinite moment. That many will yield them an eager assent, and find, or attempt to find in them a justification of their revolt, and an answer to the remonstrances of conscience, we doubt not. But it the more becomes us to recoil from the imputations they cast on God, and to vindicate his government from the misrepresentations and aspersions with which they are fraught. We shall, accordingly, proceed to show that Dr. B.'s whole speculation is founded on a false basis, and that God's ways are not obnoxious to any such charges as he alleges against them, but are marked by immeasurable wisdom, rectitude, and benevolence.

1. The denial that God is able to make his being, character, rights, and will, known to any of his new created and unfallen moral creatures in such a measure and form as to prevent them from sinning and prompt them to obedience, is, on the one hand, to deny his infinite power, wisdom, and skill, and exhibit him as inadequate to the exercise of a moral government that shall secure the well-being of his empire; and on the other, to represent men as in their moral agency independent of his sway. For if he cannot communicate to them any form and measure of knowledge of himself of which their nature is capable, and which they, at later stages of their existence, attain, it must be because he has not an absolute control over their faculties, that he cannot determine their thoughts, and cannot even excite in them perceptions that may be awakened by second causes. But that is absurd and impossible. He that formed the eye, does not he know how to cause it to see all the classes of objects which its nature fits it to discern? He that made the ear, cannot he cause it to hear all the species of sounds which it is formed to receive? He that created the intellect, does not he know how to awaken in it every form of perception, to people it with every species of idea and conception which it is its very office to entertain? And cannot he make its ideas, apprehensions, and imaginations the grounds of precisely such convictions, judgments, emotions, and desires as they are the means of awakening at later periods of their existence? The denial of it is a solecism. As, then, he can communicate whatever knowledge, in kind and degree, he pleases, to deny that he can thereby restrain new created and unfallen beings from distrust, unbelief, and sin, is to imply that their constitution,

as it comes from his hands, is naturally impelled by just and large views of his character and will, to aversion to him and dislike of his service; which is to represent that they are necessarily, from the structure of their minds, his enemies; and is to charge him, therefore, with calling them into being with natures violently and resistlessly tending to sin; which is the identical accusation from which it is Dr. B.'s professed object in his volume to exculpate the Most High.

The first point of Dr. B.'s theory is, therefore, false. It is an infinite misrepresentation both of God and his creatures. The limitations of knowledge to which they are subjected in the first stages of their existence are not the result of a physical necessity, but are voluntarily permitted by him, and the trial to which they are thereby exposed, instead of unavoidable, is designed.

2. The assertion that God is bound to exempt his creatures, as far as it is in his power, from trial, and place them in the most favorable conditions possible for their preservation from sin, is altogether erroneous, and subversive of his right to exercise a moral government over them. For it implies that he has no right that he can enforce without injustice and malevolence; which is to assume that he has no right whatever. If he has any real right over them, and they owe him any corresponding obligation, then surely their violation of that obligation is criminal, and may be justly punished. If, therefore, he cannot, consistently with rectitude and benevolence, enforce his claims by putting their allegiance to a trial, then it is clear that he has no rights, and the pretext of exercising an authoritative moral government over them is an imposition.

But the right of putting them to trial, and causing them to show whether they bear him a true allegiance or not, is involved necessarily in the right of exercising a moral government over them, and the necessity of enforcing the one is involved in the necessity of exercising the other. The very creation of moral beings constitutes a necessity of placing them under law. That is the very object for which they are called into existence. It were a violation of wisdom, justice, and benevolence, to confer on them the faculties of moral agency, and yet to treat them as though they possessed no such nature. A moral necessity, therefore, of placing them



under law results from the faculties with which they are endowed. The establishment of a government over them is thus made as essential to God's rectitude and benevolence as obedience to it is to their virtue and happiness. But to place them under law is to put them to trial. It is to subject them to restraint. It is to require them to acknowledge their subordination to him, to relinquish their wishes, to repress their desires as far as he may enjoin, and bring all their thoughts, affections, and interests into submission to him. Their being put to a trial of their allegiance is thus the necessary effect, and, indeed, is the object of the establishment of a government over them.

What a pitiable conception of him it is to imagine that *he* cannot even take the first step towards the assertion of his rights over his creatures, without a forfeiture of all title to the character of rectitude and benevolence,—but that *their* right to demand safety and happiness from him is so sacred and imperious, that he is bound for their sakes to forego his infinite prerogatives, and subordinate himself to them! Yet this—notwithstanding the vast parade he makes of his principles of equity and honor, and lavish professions of concern for God's glory—is the great central feature, the very genius of Dr. B.'s theological system!

3. God not only has a right to place his moral creatures under law, by which they are put under a necessity of showing what their dispositions towards him are, but it is righteous and benevolent in him to subject them to a special trial of their allegiance, in order that proper grounds may exist for his treating them as indubitably his attached and steadfast children, by establishing over them a government that contemplates them as such, and places them in conditions, and bestows on them rewards more favorable to their safety, virtue, and happiness, than he otherwise could. The design of the special trials to which they are subjected is, to cause them to make a definitive choice of his service, if they will, and give such decisive proofs of their unalterable love, that he may be justified in the eyes of his kingdom in publicly acknowledging them as such, and conforming his government over them to that character. He could not with propriety publicly accept them as having given indubitable proofs of supreme love, and reward them as children who

had shown that they would unalterably adhere to their allegiance, if they had given no such demonstrative proofs. It would imply that indubitable proofs of allegiance were not necessary to secure acceptance by him, and were not essential, therefore, to a perfect character, nor to perfect happiness. It would thence be to depreciate his rights, to contradict his laws, and to overturn his government. An indisputable demonstration of their supreme and unalterable love, by the resistance of temptation and persistence in obedience against powerful excitements to sin, is indispensable in order to their being publicly accepted as his submissive and devoted children, assured of his everlasting favor, and placed under an administration that shall for ever exempt them from danger, and confirm them in righteousness and bliss. And their admission to such a relationship, and reception of its peculiar gifts, are essential to the full perfection of their character and their happiness. Without it, they would for ever continue on trial, and in a measure of uncertainty and anxiety respecting its issue. They could never enjoy the highest tokens for which their nature fits them of his approval and love; nor have a perfect assurance of their final happiness. Their subjection to decisive trials that are limited to a short period, and that exempt them thereafter from danger, and exalt them to blessings and enjoyments which otherwise they could never reach, enters therefore as an essential element into a wise and benevolent government over them. It is a work of the infinite wisdom, righteousness, and love of God, accordingly; not as Dr. B.'s theory implies, of an unfeeling despotism that tramples down the rights and well-being of creatures to accomplish its arbitrary and merciless purposes.

4. When new created agents put on trial are the head and progenitors of a race, as our first parents were of ours, whose obedience or fall is to transmit its effects to their posterity, and determine the nature of the administration under which they are to be placed; such a decisive trial is of the utmost importance. To make an obedience of such a first pair, that instead of a decisive test of their allegiance, left it uncertain but that they would apostatize, were they exposed to severe temptation, the ground not only of their acceptance and exemption from all further trial, but of the

institution of a rule over them that secured the eternal obedience and blessedness of their posterity also, would be to treat decisive proofs of supreme love to God, as not essential to acceptance, and the reception from him of the richest and most enduring blessings, which he bestows on his devoted children; and would, therefore, depreciate his rights, cast a cloud of darkness over his perfections, and overturn his government. To connect, however, with the inflexible rectitude of such a pair demonstrated under decisive trials, the eternal safety, sanctitude, and bliss of their offspring; to raise as the reward of their filial allegiance amidst the storms of temptation, the countless throngs of their descendants to the rank of adopted children of God, and the enjoyment of all the infinite gifts of his love, is ineffably beautiful, and worthy of the grandeur of God's wisdom and benevolence.

5. Where a representative pair, like our first parents, fall, it is consistent with the rectitude and benevolence of God, that he should cause their fall to involve their posterity in such of the penal evils which it immediately devolves on them—as the loss of that favor, which God manifests to his obedient children, and of the Spirit's presence, a sentence to mortality, and a life under a providential administration that contemplates them as fallen beings. That these consequences were devolved on our race by the fall of Adam, the Scriptures most specifically teach; and that fact alone is proof of its rectitude and wisdom. But it is apparent also from the consideration that it involves no violation of the rights of those to whom his fall transmits those consequences. First, nothing is withdrawn from them to which they have an absolute title. Next, no positive penal evils are inflicted on them but such as are temporary—namely, mortality, pain, want, sickness, death, that do not necessarily involve their final destruction, but are compatible with their redemption. Thirdly, they are not sentenced to eternal death, except on the ground of sins committed by themselves. Fourthly, they are immediately placed under a probationary dispensation, to determine whether they will return from alienation and obtain eternal life thereby, or continue in revolt; and all who return to obedience are pardoned and saved. The whole race are as truly put on probation,

as Adam and Eve were; with this difference, that the question to be decided with Adam and Eve was, whether they would continue in obedience; the question on trial with their posterity is, whether they will continue in rebellion, or return to obedience; and the final award of each depends on his conduct under this trial. To deny, not merely that God can, without injustice, withhold the tokens of favor which he manifests to his obedient children, withdraw the presence of his Spirit, and leave the mind under the power of the natural causes that act on it; all of which are compatible with its responsibility—but that he can without injustice inflict bodily suffering, is, in effect, to claim with Dr. B. that he is bound at all events to secure the happiness of his creatures, and at every stage of their existence.

But finally, the infinite wisdom and benevolence of making the head of such a race its representatives in their trial, and on their falling placing their posterity in precisely the same condition as the fallen parents are placed as to the immediate consequences of their sin, putting them to the same trial as that to which the parents are then subjected, whether they will live in rebellion or turn to obedience; is manifest from the consideration, that it is on such a representative principle alone, that a work of redemption can be instituted for them, and the blessings they need of renovation, pardon, deliverance from death, and finally adoption as God's children, and admission to his eternal favor, be bestowed on them. That if a redemption is accomplished for them, and they are exalted to a state as glorious and blissful as they would have enjoyed, had the first pair not fallen,—it must be wrought by a head and representative in another trial, who shall maintain his allegiance, yield a perfect obedience, achieve an expiation of their sins by his death, and obtain a right thereby to transmit to all or as many as he pleases, the infinite blessings of renovation, pardon, deliverance from sorrow, suffering, and death itself, adoption as God's children, and admission to his everlasting favor,—we know from the most ample teachings of the Scriptures, and the fact that Christ became such a head and representative of the race, and accomplished the salvation of those whom he redeems, by obeying and suffering in that relation. But there is no reason to suppose that that could

have been the principle of redemption, if it had not been the principle of the fall. If Adam's acting as the representative of the race in his fall, and transmitting to them such penal effects, was not legitimate, it is plain that for the same reasons he could not have acted as their representative, had he maintained his allegiance. And if he could not, as the head of the race, legitimately have transmitted to his posterity, had he obeyed, the blessings he would have himself received as a reward of his fidelity, it is clear that Christ cannot with any more propriety have acted as the head of the race in his trial and sacrifice, and procured for those whom he saves the blessings of redemption. If the principle of representation or substitution is absolutely inconsistent with justice, wisdom, and benevolence, it is clear that no redemption whatever would be possible; as there can be none except by the expiation and righteousness of a substitute in place of the persons redeemed. And if when the representative of a race falls, no evils can justly be devolved on his posterity; then undoubtedly, for the same reason, no blessings by a substitute who obeys and makes expiation, can be devolved on those for whom he stands. There is thus as absolute a certainty of the justice and propriety of such a representative agency as that of Adam carrying evil to his posterity; as there is of the justice, wisdom, and benevolence of Christ's representative agency, in obeying and dying, in transmitting blessings to those for whom he stood.

It is probable that the principle of representation, in place of being confined to our world, is a great law of intelligent agents of all orders who propagate their kind. And such it is not unreasonable to suppose are the occupants of myriads and millions of planets that, like ours, are fitted to be the residence of bodied beings. Its righteousness, wisdom, and benevolence, may have been exemplified in millions and millions of worlds, and be justly regarded by the infinite crowd that people the vast realms of the Almighty, as one of the most beautiful and beneficent measures of his boundless administration.

6. When men who have fallen are put upon trial to determine whether they will return to obedience and accept redemption through Christ, or will continue in sin, it is

obviously of the utmost importance that the trial should be effective, and present the most indubitable exhibition of their true character. If they continue in revolt, it is essential, in order to the vindication of God's justice in their everlasting punishment, that they should have displayed the most decisive proofs that they are his enemies. Otherwise, those who witness their condemnation and punishment might be without the requisite evidence in their conduct itself, that God dealt with them according to their genuine dispositions towards him. If they turn from revolt, become obedient, and accept salvation through Christ, it is equally indispensable for God's vindication, that they should present the most indubitable proofs that they have become truly changed from enmity to love, and are meet to be owned and accepted of him, as his true children. Otherwise, it might be doubted whether those whom he treats as having become reconciled to him, are not hypocrites, professing allegiance to him from some sinister end, and sure to return to revolt should he withdraw from them the gifts which it is their object to secure. God accordingly takes the most effective measures to determine this great question, in such a manner, that no room can exist for doubt that the awards he is at length to distribute, are in accordance with the character of those who receive them.

7. There is nothing in the nature of the fallen mind itself, that forms a justification or excuse for its sin. Dr. B. indeed maintains that if this is their first existence, God is infinitely unjust in giving men such a nature as they have, and insists that they are not responsible in any measure for their sins, but that the blame belongs wholly to God. But this is disproved by the fact, that God treats them as wholly blamable for their offences and justly obnoxious to punishment for them, and makes their redemption from the penalty of their transgressions the work of pure grace. To assert, therefore, that they are not altogether blamable, and in the measure which he represents them, for their sins, is to exhibit his whole government as an infinite complication of misrepresentation and injustice. But that they are not excused by anything in their fallen nature, for their sins, is demonstrated, as was shown in our former article, by the fact that they are universally conscious that they are themselves

blamable for their transgressions in precisely the manner and degree which God represents them as being. There is not a solitary faculty, passion, or susceptibility in the mind, for the evil acts of which sinful men do not regard themselves as blamable. There is not a solitary act towards man or God, which the Bible represents as sinful, that is not regarded as such also by men generally, and universally when proper care is taken to ascertain its real nature. Instead of their criminal actions being rendered unblamable by the nature of the affections or motives from which they spring; it is usually in a large degree because those affections and aims are precisely what they are, that those actions have the guilt which God ascribes to them; and finally, if it were not so—if the fact that men are fallen beings, released them from responsibility and blame for their sins; then the effect of their fall would be an absolute *innocence* in all their subsequent agency, and the entire exemption, therefore, of all the posterity of Adam from all guilt in their offences, all just liability to punishment as transgressors, and thence all need of a redemption by the mediation of Christ. Such again is the result in which Dr. B.'s theory terminates, that if man first fell in this world, the condition into which the descendants of the first pair were brought by their fall, releases them from all blameworthiness for their sins, and devolves it altogether on God.

8. The fact that temptation is violent; that obedience can only be rendered at the price of great self-denial and suffering; does not annihilate nor diminish the obligation to obey; instead, the moments of the most terrible trial are the moments when the obligation to maintain allegiance rises to the greatest height: for it is then that the question at issue is determined, and salvation gained or lost. Obedience at those crises God accepts as forming decisive proofs of inflexible fidelity, and crowns with the rewards of eternal life. If the vehemence of passion, if the strength of selfishness, if the bitterness of suffering lessened the obligation to be holy, or, in other words, constituted a legitimate reason for sinning, then the guilt of evil would diminish just in proportion to the eagerness with which it was loved; which would be to make wickedness its own excuse and justification, precisely in the ratio of its vehemence and atrocity

which is a solecism. A trial on that supposition would not be a trial of virtue. It would be a mere process of annihilating the obligation and motive to be holy, divesting the most guilty acts of their evil nature, and rendering them unmeaning and indifferent. Of the crowd of witnesses whose fidelity Paul celebrates, the most distinguished were those who rendered the great acts of obedience which gave them their peculiar place in the catalogue of God's children, in conditions of the greatest possible difficulty, and at the sacrifice of the most precious blessings and hopes of life. They relinquished wealth and honors, they were driven into exile to escape their enemies, they wandered in deserts, they sought shelter in the dens and caverns of the mountains from those who pursued their lives, they gave up their children, they submitted to outrage and torture, they laid down their lives at the call of God rather than swerve from his service to sin; and it is because of their unfaltering faith and steadfast allegiance in those agonizing conditions that they are held up as examples of holiness to believers of all ages.

9. The fact that there is an antecedent certainty that men will act as they do in the circumstances in which they are placed, is no obstacle whatever to their responsibility for their actions. The certainty beforehand that they will be placed in those conditions, and that when placed in them they will act precisely as they do, no more detracts from their responsibility, than the fact that they are in those conditions when they exert their actions does.

That there is an antecedent certainty that men will sin as they do, and that the blame of their sins is precisely such as the Bible represents, and is all their own, is shown by the fact that God proceeds on them as certainties in his government, and founds on them all the great measures of the work of redemption. No more stupendous and awful proof can be conceived that men are and were to be, in agency and character, precisely what the Scriptures represent them, than is presented in the fact that God instituted the administration he is now exercising over them, which contemplates them as such sinners, at the fall, before any of the posterity of Adam, who are the subjects of it, had come into existence; and that for immeasurably the greater portion of them, expiation was made by Christ before they had come into being.



What a resistless demonstration that we are sinners, and that the blame of our sins belongs exclusively to us? It was as certain to God beforehand that we were to be precisely such offenders as we are, and that the guilt of our sins was to be what it is, and was to be altogether ours, as it was that we were to exist. On the other hand, what a sublime proof that those whom he redeems are truly reconciled to him, have become his genuine children, and are meet to be adopted as such and admitted to his kingdom, is presented in the fact, that before the foundation of the world he chose them unto salvation, wrote their names in his book of life, and laid up for them the crown of glory which he is to bestow on them at their resurrection and final acceptance! No other testimony from God, so vast, so resistless, and so awe-inspiring, can be conceived to the fact that we are identically such beings in nature, condition, sin, and responsibility as his word represents, as he thus utters in those great measures of his administration, which affect the well-being of such innumerable hosts, and are to extend their influence through eternal ages.

No more awful contradiction to this great feature of God's government can be devised than that which is presented in Dr. B.'s theory, that the nature and condition of men, which form the ground of the certainty on which the Most High thus proceeds, divest them of their responsibility, render them blameless for their sins, and transfer the guilt of their perpetration to him! If men are not precisely such sinners as these measures of his administration represent, but are excusable for their offences, then his government is an infinite complication of injustice, and renders him, as Dr. B. openly affirms, undeserving "the honor, reverence, and worship of his creatures." If the blame of their sins is not identically such as his law represents, and exclusively theirs, then the redemption of such as are saved, by the expiation and righteousness of Christ, is an immeasurable deception, and instead of investing his attributes with glory, shrouds them in eternal darkness and dishonor.

10. Instead of its being the main object of God's present administration to exempt men from temptation, and preserve them from forfeiting their well-being by sin, it is its great aim to put them to trial, and cause them to embody

their affections and principles in action, and show forth their genuine character. The government of the race, from the fall to the present time, may justly be said to be one vast experiment upon their nature; the result of which is to show, on the one hand, on the largest scale, that they are, when left without the renewing influences of the Spirit, the enemies of God and each other,—selfish, malignant, bloody, averse to goodness, regardless of right, impious, remorseless,—and that if abandoned of God they would universally continue in sin, and sink for ever to lower and lower depths of debasement and wickedness: and on the other, that those whom he renews and redeems are truly changed from enemies to friends, transformed into his image, and made meet for the adoption, glorification, and blessedness to which he exalts them. The distribution of the race into different nations, who have been isolated from each other in a considerable measure, and left to their own laws, manners, and religion, has given a vastness and completeness to this experiment which it could not otherwise have attained. There have been, by that means, several thousands of independent experiments made on different portions of the race, in every conceivable variety of condition, and the issue has, in all instances, been precisely the same. The great features of their character, when left to themselves, have, in all these cases, been identically those which are forbidden by the law of God. They have been mainly devoted to the pleasures of sense, of pride, and of power, and in pursuing them have mercilessly trampled down all those who stood in their way. The great business of the nations, in respect to each other, has been war,—a struggle for supremacy by violence,—the invasion of their neighbors, the slaughter of armies, the sack of cities and massacre of their inhabitants, the devastation of fields, and the subjugation of the conquered to the arbitrary and cruel will of the conqueror. Of all the spectacles which the universe exhibits, this is the most astonishing. Death is the penalty of sin, and the most awful symbol of its guilt and of the ruin which it draws after it that is conceivable; and it terminates probation, and renders the eternal ruin of those certain who meet it in alienation from God. Yet men, instead of shrinking from it with the horror it should inspire, and waiting its infliction by the hand of the Almighty, anti-

cipate, with an eager fury, his avenging stroke, and make it their ambition, their pride, and their glory to execute on each other the sentence of his law, and consign one another to the ignominy of death and the misery of perdition. Of all the dreadful forms which the malice of men has assumed towards each other, there is none that, antecedent to the event, could have been deemed so monstrous and improbable as this.

All the great nations of the earth have risen to their power and dominion by the sword, and at the price of immense slaughters, the destruction of numerous cities, the devastation of wide provinces, the merciless subjection of vast crowds of both sexes and all ages to captivity and slavery, and the cruel oppression of the others who fell under their sway. All the finest parts of central and western Asia, of northern Africa, and of eastern and southern Europe, have been overrun scores and scores of times during the last twenty-five centuries, by devastating armies, drenched with the blood of their inhabitants, and strewn with desolation. What a stupendous, what an awful proof that men are what the Bible represents them,—the enemies of God and one another, under the sway of the most selfish, brutal, and malignant passions, and ready to sweep one another in crowds to destruction, to gain a momentary possession of the objects of their appetites, pride, and ambition! The smaller nations and tribes, like those of central and southern Africa, this continent, and the islands of the Pacific and Indian seas, have been engaged in incessant contests with each other, and displayed an equal bloodiness and ferocity. Contemplated in this relation, man has shown himself to be—in place of a just, beneficent, and holy being—a wild beast that lives by preying on its fellow brutes.

In the conduct of men towards God, they have made a still more awful display of the dreadful depths of alienation, debasement, and impiety to which they have sunk. Every nation on earth has, at some time during its history, and the most cultivated and refined among the ancients during the whole of their most flourishing periods, apostatized from God, and turned to the homage of mere ideal beings, men, statues, and even brutes of the meanest and most disgusting forms, and sanctioned and licensed by their religion every species of cruel and debasing crime. Can a more astonishing proof

be conceived of total alienation from God? Could it, anterior to the experiment, have been thought possible that intelligences who retained the idea of religion, could sink to such an abyss of sottishness and impiety?

The only true religion that has existed in the world, has been introduced by the special intervention of God himself, and maintained by the power of his renewing Spirit, and the care of his providence; and that religion, instead of being welcomed by the nations generally, though demonstrated to be from God by the most impressive miracles, has been rejected by the great mass of those to whom it has been proclaimed, its teachers and disciples everywhere scorned, persecuted, and put to death, and its doctrines and worship corrupted and converted, by its very teachers and ministers, into a monstrous system of superstition and idolatry. The church itself has, in its principal branches, for ages been the greatest fosterer of false worship that the world has ever seen,—the vilest and most audacious corrupter of morals, and the most cruel and savage tyrant. Its favorite instruments for the repression of sin and the conversion of men to piety, for ages have been the rack, the gibbet, the pyre, and the sword. Every expedient that the most ingenious malice could devise has been exhausted to exterminate Christianity from the earth; and it has been saved from extinction only by the perpetual interposition of Christ to renew fresh individuals, and keep alive a line of true worshippers. Thus in every sphere in which men who have been left of God to follow their own tastes, have acted, they have given the most boundless and terrible proofs that they are what he represents them in his word. Not a species of crime can be designated, either towards God or man, that they have not committed on a great scale for thousands of years.

On the other hand, an experiment equally severe and decisive has been made of the hearts of God's children, by which they have been led to show, in the most indubitable and emphatic forms, the reality of their reconciliation to him, and steadfast devotion to his service. They have usually shared, in more than an ordinary degree, in the calamities and sorrows that are common to all; as it is a special aim of God's providence over them, to discipline their hearts, to show them their sinfulness, to rebuke their attachment to the world, to impress

them with a realization of God's dominion and right to withdraw the blessings with which he has distinguished them, to call them to penitence, self-denial, trust, submission, prayer, and train them to the habitual exercise of all the graces that belong to his children, and finally to cause them to show their inflexible devotion to him, and readiness, at his call, to relinquish all earthly gifts for his sake. - But in addition to these trials, of which the unsanctified also partake, they have in vast numbers, in almost every age for four thousand years, been subjected to others of a still severer cast, because of their allegiance to God;—scorned, hated, maligned, denounced as his enemies, and the enemies of man, outlawed, persecuted, robbed of their property, driven into exile, tortured, and put to death in the most ignominious and excruciating forms. Millions on millions in the glow of youth and beauty, millions on millions in the strength and courage of mature life, and countless hosts in the decline and decrepitude of age, have been called to meet this storm of suffering, this fiery tempest of human malice, more irritating and dismaying to the heart than mere corporeal pain, and show by their meek submission, their inflexible fidelity, their unconquerable love, the infinite contrast of their spirit and principles, to those of their torturers, and make it manifest to the gazing universe, that they had become the genuine friends of God, and were meet to be acknowledged as such by adoption, and admission to the joys and glories of his kingdom.

The government of God is thus so conducted that a vast display is made of the heart of man natural and regenerate in its genuine characters. He is exhibited in all the variety of conditions, and under all the diversities of influence that are possible; and an infinite sum of proofs accumulated on the one side of his utter alienation from God in his natural state; his disposition to reject and pervert the redemption that is provided for him; his debasement to selfishness, pride, sensuality, and malice; and the utter hopelessness of his ever arresting himself in his career of sin, if left without the gracious and all-subduing influences of the Holy Spirit: and on the other side, of the radical change of those whom God treats as his children, and transformation into the love, the sanctitude, and the fidelity of his unspotted worshippers; and demonstration therefore in the most resistless forms and

on the most ample scale, of the truth and rectitude of the grounds on which God proceeds in the great acts of his administration in condemning and redeeming men. And what an overpowering impression must the spectacle make on the beings who eye it from the heavenly world! To what an awful sense must they be raised of the dreadful character and condition to which they inevitably sink who revolt from God and are left to the sway of the passions which take possession of them when deserted of his Spirit! With what astonishment must they contemplate the malignant and hideous forms which sin assumes! the shocking debasement, the reckless selfishness, the lawless ambition, the merciless cruelty, the daring impiousness, which ravage the breast, when love is exchanged for hate, and sanctitude for pollution! How profound must be their feeling that God is justified in condemning and punishing them as enemies; and that to pursue any other course towards them were to abandon his own rectitude, and invest his glories with a shroud of darkness. How resistless must be their feeling that they who are saved, are saved by sovereign grace; and how undoubting and joyous their assurance that those whom he pardons and raises to his kingdom, are fitted for the lofty relation to him to which they are exalted, by a perfect restoration to his image, and meetness for the honors and services of his eternal presence! That these exemplifications take place is indisputable; that it is one of the objects of the present administration to produce them, no one can question; and they are undoubtedly to have an important bearing on the widely different administration that is to be instituted when Christ comes, assumes the government of the world, and brings all nations into obedience to his sceptre.

11. A vast proportion of the allotments which prove the source of the greatest temptations and trials of men, instead of being unavoidable, are appointed for the express purpose of putting them to the test, and causing them to show by decisive action what their dispositions are towards God and one another. Not only are the judgments that are inflicted on them in chastisement for their sins, such as wars, slaughters, captivities, famines, pestilences, and innumerable similar evils that result to individuals from their transgressions, of the class; but all the appointments generally that bring

them into difficulties, reveal their dependence, disappoint their hopes, and subject them to self-denial, necessity, and sorrow. This, we are expressly taught, was the design of the extraordinary difficulties and straits to which the Israelites were subjected on their journey through the wilderness. "Thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness *to humble thee, and to prove thee, to know what was in thine heart, whether thou wouldst keep his commandments or no. And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live.*"—Deut. viii. 2, 3. We are thus assured that all the extraordinary allotments by which that people were perplexed, alarmed, subjected to hunger and thirst, and exposed, apparently, to destruction during their abode in the wilderness, and the miraculous deliverances that were wrought for them, and unexpected and wonderful provisions made for their necessities, were expressly designed to prove their hearts, to lead them to show what was in them, and to determine whether they would keep God's commandments or not. And that is the aim, we are everywhere taught in the Bible, of his providence generally over nations and individuals. It is that he may make them know that he is Jehovah, that he rules the world, and gives and takes the blessings that are essential to their safety and happiness, and cause them to show what their dispositions are towards him, and present the requisite grounds for the eternal awards he is to assign them. And it is announced that at length all nations are to come and worship before him in consequence of the judgments he is thus to manifest. The whole course of his providence is accordingly eminently adapted to show men their dependence on him, and their relations to their fellow men, and cause them to manifest, in the most decisive and emphatic forms, their principles and affections. Want, toil, suffering, disappointment, misfortune, injurious treatment, sickness, sorrow, and every other evil in a ceaseless train, and in ten thousand forms, fill the lives of most families and individuals, and subject their passions and principles to a perpetual trial. The whole system of providence, like a vast complication of ma-

chinery, is formed to play on the heart, and cause it perpetually to reveal its reigning affections and aims, and no other object can be assigned for a vast proportion of these appointments by which it is most effectively tried. Were they not designed for such a moral reason, their admission into the great scheme of providence would be an inexplicable enigma.

12. It is under these peculiar allotments, accordingly, that are assigned them for the very purpose of putting them to the question, that men act out their principles and passions most conspicuously, and make the most indubitable and emphatic manifestations of their good or evil character. It is under the powerful impulse of the temptations that spring from poverty, want, forbidden appetites, disappointment, dependence, neglect, scorn, abuse, rivalry, calumny, malice, personal violence, the loss of property and position, bereavements, sorrows, and despair, on the one hand; and ease, success, wealth, luxury, distinction, flattery, the hope of power, and the like, on the other, that the unsanctified are prompted to the greatest and most awful displays of their evil passions. Let them be exempted from those extreme positions, which rouse their nature to the most powerful excitement, and they would be freed from the temptations in which most of their lowest debasements of themselves, and most atrocious crimes against one another, have their origin. In these trying conditions, whatever may before have seemed to be their character, they reveal the genuine spirit with which they are animated, and show on what dreadful terms they are willing to purchase the objects of their desire;—incurring the wrath of God, forfeiting their own everlasting well-being, trampling on the rights, sacrificing the happiness, jeopardizing the eternal salvation of their fellows, rather than forego the empty honors, the transient possessions, the momentary gratifications which they at the instant crave! God, man, conscience, and the retributive vengeance that is for ever to pursue the guilty, are defied, and shown not to have with them the force of a whisper, compared to the imperious clamors of their hungry and lawless passions!

On the other hand, it is in those conditions, and others of a still severer kind, that the children of God act out their



peculiar principles and affections in the most conspicuous forms, and present the clearest demonstrations that they have undergone a transformation into his image, and become meet to be adopted as his sons and daughters, and admitted to the bliss of his eternal presence. The crises when they exercise the most unreserved and adoring submission to him, are those in which they yield up to his hands, at his call, the most essential and cherished of his gifts—property, position, friends, happiness, health, hope; and bending in subjection to his avenging strokes, acknowledge his righteousness and faithfulness, and are drawn by his very rebukes, and heart-rending chastenings, to closer union to him, a fuller trust in him, and a more perfect consecration to his service. The periods of his darkest frowns, of his most tempestuous and unsparing judgments, are the periods of their deepest penitence, their heartiest self-renunciation, their most emphatic acknowledgment of his rightful sway; they are the seasons of their most adoring views of his wisdom and goodness, their most enraptured love of his perfections, their most joyous trust in his promises, their most fervent desires for sanctification, and their brightest and most triumphant hopes of his salvation; and in thousands of those conjunctures, the strength to which their holy affections rise, and the decisiveness and sublimity of the proofs they give of their regenerated and filial character, are not only commensurate with the powers of their nature, roused to its utmost capacity, but greater probably far, than are exhibited by any other order of creatures. That Abraham gave a sublime proof of his allegiance in sacrificing his only son; that Paul presented a resistless demonstration of his fidelity in the trials, dangers, persecutions, and sufferings, of his long ministry; that many other eminent servants of God whose names are mentioned in the Scriptures, gave decisive and glorious proofs of unfaltering allegiance under the evils to which they were subjected for his sake, no one needs to be told. That those great acts in which they made the greatest possible sacrifice of personal interest, and surrendered everything to God, and in the most unclouded trust in him, were true indexes of their hearts, and demonstrated that he was the object of their supreme love, submission, and confidence, is as little open to question, as it is that they exerted the acts them-

selves. But myriads and millions of others, and probably most who live a considerable period after their regeneration, are called to trials that are undoubtedly very nearly equal tests of the heart, lead to as energetic and towering exercises of its holy affections, and give birth to as sublime proofs of supreme subjection to God. How many parents are summoned to surrender a favorite child, and sometimes several in quick succession, to death, in circumstances that pierce the heart with as deep an anguish, that involve a more heart-rending extinction of hope, and shroud not only the moment, but the whole of their remaining lives in a far deeper darkness than marked Abraham's sacrifice of his son! He was supported by the greatest and most specific promises. He believed that the agonies, the horrors of his trial would be confined to a brief space; that as soon as the victim should be consumed, he would be recalled by the Almighty from death, and restored to his arms. They often, after having witnessed the endurance by their children of excruciating suffering, sometimes through days and weeks, the blight of their beauty by the ravages of disease, and perhaps the extinction of their faculties, have surrendered them to death and the grave, not only with no expectation of meeting them again here, but with scarce a tremulous hope, and not unfrequently without any hope whatever, of meeting them in the realms of life hereafter. Who can doubt that the intelligences of the heavenly world who have looked down on the spectacle, witnessed the submissive silence into which the voice of nature was hushed, the adoring subjection with which their spirits were filled, their awe, their self-renunciation, their calm trust, their sense of God's righteousness, and their surrendry of all their interests to him in faith in his perfections, in rest on his promises, and in desires to be conformed to his will, have felt that they beheld in them as indubitable and sublime proofs of true piety, as were given by Abraham in the sacrifice of his son; as it is possible indeed that creatures of our limited powers should give? Many are called to trials, also, extremely dark and bitter, in the loss of property, in being hurled down from affluence and independence into an abyss of poverty, enthrallment, and despair, perhaps through the treachery, grasping ambition, or malice, of fellow men; deprived of

the means of educating their children, of adequately supplying their daily wants, of even preventing them from suffering and degradation; and compelled through a long life to struggle on in necessity and discouragement, without aid from others, and with but little sympathy or care from friends. The calm submission, the humble acquiescence, the unshaken faith in God's righteousness, wisdom, and love, the firm reliance on his care, the believing prayer, the filial gratitude for the gifts and deliverances he bestows, that are often exhibited under these trials through years, undoubtedly present one of the sublimest and most touching manifestations of true piety of which the world is the theatre. Thousands of the children of God are subjected to still more excruciating sufferings and sorrows by injurious treatment by fellow men, and often by those from whom they have a right to expect kindness, love, and protection; ingratitude from children, abuse by parents, husbands, brothers; detraction by the envious and malicious; insult, violence, and outrage from cruel and savage monsters into whose hands they are betrayed. Bound by indissoluble ties, or held in inextricable vassalage to the wretches who torture them, all the bright hopes of happiness extinguished, all the fountains of joy turned into sources of agony, horror, and despair—they present, in the patience which they exhibit under cruelty and outrage, the spotless purity they maintain amidst surrounding debasement and pollution, the adoring trust with which they look up to God, and confide in his pity, his power, and his wisdom to defend, vindicate, and deliver them, one of the loftiest and most beautiful displays of the Christian character that is possible, and in direct contact with the worst forms of brutal debasement and fiendish malice, of which the earth is the scene; and give as impressive proof that they have the spirit of God's children, and are meet for a crown, as their torturers do that they have the spirit of fiends, and are fit subjects for the chains and darkness that are reserved for God's inexorable enemies.

But beyond these sharp afflictions, in which many of the unsanctified also share, the children of God have, because of their obedience to him, in great numbers, in almost every age from the institution of Christianity, been subjected to others of a still more terrible nature, by Pagans

and usurpers and apostates bearing the Christian name, who have made war upon them, and endeavored to exterminate them from the earth. The true and the false religions have thus been brought into immediate contact, and made to show their respective characters in the most distinct and vivid contrast to each other. On the side of the persecutors the vilest, the most ferocious, and the most fiendish passions have appeared that ever ravaged the human breast; and the most daring and insolent impieties towards God. Man has shown himself to be a demon rather than a being of humane affections; a thirsty and remorseless brute, delighting in ravage and blood, rather than an intelligence in whose breast pity, sympathy, love, and justice have a residence. On the side of the martyrs, however, have been seen the purest and most fervent love, the most heroic steadfastness in allegiance, the most unconquerable attachment to truth, the loftiest triumph over all the natural passions, the most patient endurance of suffering, and the most cheerful relinquishment of all the joys and hopes of earth for righteousness' sake that eye has ever beheld, or imagination conceived. After the ingenuity of their persecutors has exhausted all its resources in inventing tortures, and their malice wearied itself in inflicting them, the suffering disciples of Jesus have still remained unconquered, and shown that no human power could shake their fidelity, and no suffering extinguish their love. This spectacle, which has been presented by innumerable hosts of every age, sex, and condition, at frequent epochs for 1800 years, is doubtless contemplated with profounder awe, wonder, conviction of the reality of the renovation of those whom God adopts as his children, and joy in the beauty of the rectitude, fidelity, and love to which they are raised, than any other that the world presents. For if these beings who maintained their allegiance under the greatest sufferings of which our nature is capable, did not demonstrate the reality of their restoration to God's image, by what conceivable acts can such a demonstration be made?

It is thus in the fierce conflicts to which each class is subjected by the sharp necessities and sorrows of life, that they act out their respective characters the most decisively, and give the most indubitable and impressive proofs that

they are truly such as God contemplates them in the eternal awards he is to assign.

13. God has so conducted the arrangements of his providence, as to give the greatest possible completeness to this experiment on the human heart. Men have been placed in great numbers, in every possible condition that could serve to bring out their reigning affections and principles, and show in indubitable forms their true character. Thus, they have been left to display their alienation from God, and the darkness and sottishness to which they have sunk, by the false religions which they have invented and substituted in place of the true. A large proportion of the nations have wholly rejected Jehovah, fallen into total ignorance of him, invented other objects of worship, and ascribed to them the rights and offered them the honors that belong only to him. Of these many have sunk into the lowest ignorance and barbarism, and lived as brutes, rather than moral beings. Others, as the Egyptians, the Assyrians, and the Hindoos, have risen to a considerable measure of culture; to arts, laws, poetry, and eloquence; but have still been without elevation, and without virtue, the victims of a debasing and cruel superstition, maintained by a hypocritical and enslaving priesthood, and the vassals and instruments of a bloody tyranny. Others still, like the Greeks and Romans, rose to the highest pitch of cultivation, especially of the useful and ornamental arts, of reason, and of the imagination, and swaying the dominion for long periods of the most populous and cultivated portions of the earth, had the amplest opportunity, if there were any restorative power in their nature, or any life-giving virtue in their religion, their philosophy, or their policy, to demonstrate it in their own lives, and in the reformation of the nations over whom they extended their rule. No such demonstration, however, was made by them. Instead, they were as distinguished for the sottishness of their dispositions, the shamelessness of their sensuality, the ferocity of their hate, and their readiness to sacrifice the well-being of all others to gratify their pride and ambition; as they were for the eminence of their genius, the greatness of their knowledge, and the refinement and beauty of many of their tastes. In place of Jehovah, they paid their religious homage to the powers and spheres of nature

personified by a wild fancy, to ideal beings, to men, to the passions and affections, and to statues of gold, silver, marble, and wood, animated their deities with their own lawless appetites and spirit, contemplated them as the exemplars and patrons of all their passions and crimes; and made their temples the scenes and schools of the grossest and most debasing vices. The vast refinement which they reached, was but a refinement in error and sin, a sublimation of intelligence and taste in false beliefs, wicked passions, and monstrous crimes.

The experiment with these nations for four thousand years has thus made a decisive and awful exhibition of what man is when left to frame a religion for himself. Instead of returning to Jehovah, he invents a crowd of false deities that resemble himself, adopts their passions and vices as apologies and sanctions of his own, and makes his vice, therefore, to be his virtue, and his impiety his religion.

An experiment terminating in an equally humiliating result has been made also with families and nations to whom God directly revealed himself, appointed a peculiar worship, and gave a law. They or their descendants almost immediately apostatized from God, and either turned to the idolatry of the pagans, or framed a counterfeit religion which they substituted in place of the true. The whole human family revolted soon after the revelation was made to our first parents of the work of redemption, and the religion of sacrifices instituted; and a few hundred years after their death, advanced to such a stage of wickedness, that God swept them from the earth by a deluge. At the distance of two or three centuries from that epoch, the descendants of Noah generally apostatized to idol worship, and with the exception of a single people, continued such down to the institution of Christianity, and most of them to the present time. The Hebrews, to whom, as his peculiar people, God appointed a worship of imposing and gorgeous rites, and manifested his presence by the most impressive and awful signs, soon revolted from his service, and turned to the homage of the idol-gods of the neighboring pagan nations; and it was only by their being surrendered into the hands of the worshippers of those cruel and bloody deities, slaughtered in vast crowds, driven into exile, and reduced to the most abject misery, that they were cured of that apos-

tasy. The Christian church, too, in three centuries from its institution, apostatized in an equally impious form, and assumed the right, at its will, of modifying the laws of God and the method of redemption, incorporated with his worship the homage of a crowd of creatures and false deities, instituted a new expiation for sin, and a new method of justification, and a vast proportion who bear the Christian name, continue in those impious errors to the present hour. Men thus, instead of welcoming the knowledge of the true God, as it has been communicated to them by fresh revelations from age to age, have speedily turned away from him, rejected his service and his salvation, and converted the very religion which he has instituted for their recovery from ruin, into a monstrous system of impiety, and made it thereby an instrument of destruction instead of salvation; and had it not been for the perpetual interpositions of the Spirit to continue a line of pure worshippers, every trace of religion would, ages since, have disappeared from the world. What more stupendous and awful exemplification can be conceived than has thus been given through six thousand years, that man is precisely such an alien as God contemplates him in the work of redemption, and that even when furnished with the knowledge of God, apprised of the salvation that is provided for him, and urged by the promise of eternal extrication from sin, and restoration to the divine favor, in place of joyfully returning to allegiance to the Most High, if left to himself, he recoils from him, and plunges headlong down the precipice of destruction.

This vast experiment of the tendency of the human heart has been diversified and raised to a higher emphasis by the retributive dispensations of providence towards those portions of the race that have apostatized to idolatry. Thus, though God has punished all the great nations that were its principal fosterers for their false worships, and swept them from existence, his exterminating judgments on them have not had the slightest effect to restrain others from the same or a similar course. And though the experience of four thousand years has shown that the gods of paganism are no deities, and that their worship only degrades a people and prepares them for destruction, it has had no influence to deter others from continuing it. In like manner, God

has smitten the nations that apostatized from Christianity to a mixed religion of God and of idols and saints, with the most devouring judgments. Of the Christianized population of Northern Africa and Western Asia who turned in the fourth and fifth centuries to the homage of the cross, of relics, of saints, and of images and pictures, scarce a trace now remains. New tribes have taken their places, and a new false religion has succeeded to that of the apostate Roman and Greek churches, which they professed. Yet that terrible manifestation of the judgment of God has not in the least checked the disposition of the neighboring nations of Europe to turn from their idolatries and superstitions, and give their homage to the true God; nor has the fact demonstrated by the experience of fifteen centuries, that the sole effect of their false religion is to demoralize and degrade them, and fit them to be the hopeless vassals of unscrupulous priests and bloody tyrants, had the slightest effect to prompt them to a return to the pure worship of Jehovah.

A trial has thus been made of man's disposition in respect to religion in all the various conditions in which he can be supposed to exist, and through an immense tract of ages; on the one hand, by the gift of a revelation, an appointed worship, and a method of redemption; and on the other hand, by leaving the nations who apostatized from God to institute religions for themselves, contrive and worship gods after their own heart, and frame schemes of salvation that accorded with their false notions and perverted tastes. No more comprehensive test can be conceived. No new condition can be imagined that would give any greater variety or completeness to the experiment. And the issue in all these cases has been the same; the most stupendous demonstration of their total alienation from God; the utter hopelessness, not merely of their self-restoration, but of their spontaneous submission to a restoration by the power of God; their headlong proclivity when put in possession of the true religion to reapostatize, and convert the very means provided for their sanctification and redemption, into a means of demoralization and destruction. Can a more awful spectacle be conceived than the world thus presents? Can a more resistless demonstration be imagined of the grounds



on which God proceeds in all the great measures of his government that contemplate men as enemies, hopelessly lost, and needing such a redemption as is wrought for them by Christ?

14. The nature of this great experiment, on the heart of man, and the demonstration in which it terminates, indicates that it is not a final dispensation, but is preparatory to some other of a different character. It cannot be thought probable that any end pursued by the divine administration can require the continuance of such an economy for ever. It is conceivable that a point may be reached in the exemplifications which it achieves that shall render it unnecessary to carry them any farther; that such a vastness and completeness of demonstration may at length be attained of God's great rights and perfections, of man's unregenerate nature and character, and of the reality of their restoration to the divine image who are forgiven and admitted to his kingdom, that he may thereafter proceed on them as ascertained certainties, that need no further proof in order to his vindication; and thence introducing a new dispensation, may convert the nations universally, and make them partakers of salvation through a long series of ages, without exposing any of his holy subjects to the danger of misapprehending his administration, or feeling uncertain of the righteousness, benevolence, and wisdom of his ways. And such the Scriptures teach us is the great office of the present dispensation; such is the gracious purpose of the Most High in respect to the future. The trial of the race, in this state, is soon to reach its catastrophe, on the one hand, in a more awful manifestation than has ever yet taken place, of the alienation of the unrenowned from God, by an attempt of the apostate and persecuting powers to exterminate the true worshippers from the earth, and bring the whole church under their imperious sway; and on the other, a more impressive and sublime exemplification than at any former period, of the indubitable love and fidelity of God's believing people in their unfaltering utterance of their witness for him at that crisis, and calm submission to the stroke of death for his sake, in the belief of a speedy resurrection by his power and exaltation to thrones and sceptres in his kingdom. After that public and glorious vindication of his

true worshippers, the last storm of his avenging judgments will begin to descend on the nations; the apostate powers will make another attempt to crush his worshippers, and secure to themselves the dominion of the earth, when the Son of God descending from heaven in power and glory, will strike them by his avenging lightnings to destruction, and assuming himself the sceptre of the earth, commence his millennial reign over it with the risen saints, and bring all nations, peoples, and languages to submission to his sway. Then we are assured by the lips of the Saviour himself, all the tempestuous trials, all the perilous conflicts of the present dispensation are to cease. Satan is to be bound and precluded from tempting men. All things are to be made new. The atmosphere and earth will be renovated. Men themselves will undergo a glorious transformation in soul and body, and be restored to much the state in which they would have existed had they not fallen; "and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things" will "have passed away;" "and the tabernacle of God," in which he visibly reveals himself, "shall be with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God."—Rev. xxi. 3-5. We have thus the most explicit assurance that at that great epoch, the terrible inflictions and trials of the present dispensation are to be wholly discontinued, and the race brought into the most intimate and gracious relations to God, purified from all their unrighteousness, and exalted to the unspotted sanctitude and unalloyed blessedness of his adopted children. (Rev. xxi. 23-27; xxii. 1-5.) This blissful reign—during which they are to continue to multiply, and innumerable millions are to be saved—is to extend through the vast round of a prophetic millennium, or three hundred and sixty-five thousand years. Then Satan is to be released for a short season, and allowed to seduce a portion of the nations again to revolt; by which it will be shown that the sanctification and redemption of those who were saved during the millennium were the work of grace, not of human might or skill. That revolt will be immediately terminated by the destruction of the rebellious by fire from heaven, which.

will be followed by the resurrection and judgment of the unholy dead, the final dejection of Satan to the world of punishment, the destruction of death and the grave, and the everlasting deliverance of those who are then in the natural body, and their descendants through the circuit of eternal years, from sin, death, suffering, sorrow, want, and all the evils brought on the race by the fall.

15. This great scheme which contemplates at length the complete restoration of the race from the evils of the fall, and their multiplication and blessedness through eternal years, thus furnishes an ample solution of the present dispensation, in the office it fills as a necessary preparative for that. In the public exposition which is to be made of its measures in the judgment of the holy, at the beginning of the millennium, and of the unholy and Satan and his angels at the close of that period, a perfect vindication is to take place of all the ways of God which men now assail or doubt, and demonstration that they are worthy of the infinite wisdom and love that contrive and execute a scheme of such immeasurable greatness and grandeur.

First, it will be seen that God not only has a right to subject his creatures to trial, but that it is essential to the very exercise of a moral government, and that the ends for which he subjects men to the ceaseless tests of their allegiance under the present dispensation, are of the utmost significance, and invest the measure with a dazzling effulgence of wisdom and benevolence. Secondly, it will be seen that there is nothing in the condition of man in his fallen state, either internally or externally, that justifies him in his sin, but that each individual is as responsible for the offences which he commits, as Adam and Eve were for their first transgression; and all the accusations of Dr. Beecher and others, who attempt to transfer the blame of their sins to God, will be confuted and hushed in eternal silence. Thirdly, it will be seen that he is not required by justice and goodness, as Dr. B. and some others contend, to do all in his power to prevent his creatures from sinning; and that his leaving them to sin is not because he cannot prevent them from it; but that he voluntarily permits them to fall although able to retain them, and that he has reasons for it that are as momentous and as glorious to his wisdom and goodness,

as the final redemption of the race from the ruin of the fall is, which is to be accomplished in consequence of it. Fourthly, it will be seen that God can leave fallen beings to continue in sin, and can punish them for their offences in perfect rectitude and wisdom. This Dr. B. and thousands of others in effect deny, and Satan, very probably, had the hope that in betraying our first parents to a fall that was to carry such disastrous effects to their posterity, he should make it impossible to God to exercise a government over them that should be capable of perfect reconciliation with justice and goodness, and should therefore be able to convict the Most High of a fatal inadequacy to the station he aims to fill, and thence of unworthiness of the homage he demands; and so find a justification of his revolt, and the rebellion of others. But all these impious aims and accusations will be overwhelmed in eternal confutation. It will be seen that God has not violated the rights of any of his creatures whom he has left to sin, in not hindering them from transgression. It will be seen that he had reasons of infinite righteousness, wisdom, and benevolence, in putting them to the trials in which they fall, and in refraining from using effective means to withhold them from transgression. It will be seen that the punishments he inflicts on them are in exact accordance with their ill-desert. He is to judge and reward them according to the deeds done in the body. It will be seen that he makes his justice to them the means of boundless good to others, by the exemplification it presents of his rights, by the confutation it forms of the accusations of his enemies, and by the prevention which results from it of the necessity of subjecting others to a similar punishment. Fifthly, it will be seen that the subjection of men to severe trials of their allegiance, and their being left to sin, were carried no further than was requisite to the assertion and exemplification of his rights, the demonstration of the reality of the great truths respecting the alienation and guilt of the fallen, and the restoration of the pardoned, in which he proceeds in his administration, *on such a scale* as to make it compatible with his glory, and the well-being of his holy kingdom, to introduce a new administration, under which he will put an end to those evils, and extend the blessings of renovation, pardon, and acceptance to the whole popula-

tion of the globe, through the endless succession of their generations ; and that the great scheme of his procedure was therefore in every respect worthy of the grandeur of his perfections, and must command the awe, admiration, gratitude, and praise of all his holy subjects throughout their eternal years.

Such are the great reasons of the administration God is now exercising over the world ; such are the infinite results which it contemplates ; such the dazzling splendors in which it is to display his wisdom, might, and love. Can a greater contrast be conceived than it forms to the wretched dreams, the wild and delirious fancies of Dr. Beecher, who begins by denying God's attributes and rights, then charges his administration with infinite arbitrariness and injustice, and finally affects to exculpate him by an hypothesis, that but repeats and exacerbates that accusation, and exhibits him as without either the power, the wisdom, the justice, or the goodness that is requisite to make him the object of homage, or fit him for his station as the ruler of the universe ! But Dr. B. has not caught a glimpse either of God's attributes in their greatness and sanctity, of his prerogatives, or of the scheme of his government. Notwithstanding the ostentatious professions he makes of respect for his word, he in fact rejects it, and in the most undisguised and dogmatic manner makes his own notions of what it becomes God to do, the criterion by which his procedure is to be judged ; and on that ground denounces him—on the supposition that this world is the scene of man's first existence—as infinitely unjust and undeserving “the honor, reverence, and worship of his creatures.” Of the great ends that are subserved by the present dispensation, of the wholly different economy that is to follow it, he takes no notice. They do not lie within the sweep of his *a priori* speculations. Instead of seeing that a main object of the present administration is to demonstrate that man is hopelessly averse to God, he conceives that the Most High is not able effectually to rule his creatures, and bind them in indissoluble attachment to his throne ; and that each individual, consequently, must at least in a great measure extricate himself from the thralldom of sin, if he ever escapes it ; and must be the great auxiliary agent, also, in the extrication of others, if they are

delivered from its bondage. The world, accordingly, he assumes, if it is ever to be converted, is to be converted by the instrumentality of man, and exerted as it is under the present system;—not by the direct interposition and resistless power of God. That Christ is to come in great power and glory and assume the dominion of the earth, dash his incorrigible foes to destruction, raise his dead saints to life, repeal the great curse of the fall, toil, sorrow, death, place the population that survive that epoch in a condition much like that in which they would have existed had our first parents not fallen, bestow his renewing Spirit on them as universally as, had sin not entered the world, he would have given them his preserving and sanctifying aid; and that by those almighty means the whole are to be raised to a sanctitude and blessedness, worthy of such a paradise as the earth is then to be—this great scheme of God's wisdom and love, Dr. B., instead of accepting, rejects, and regards with contempt and scorn. It does not accord with his *a priori* philosophy. It places God on the throne, and man in the dust; and hence the darkness and distress in which he is involved by his conviction, that the God who actually reigns over man is a totally different being from the God of his preconceptions. Had he taken the Bible as his guide; had he accepted the explanations which God has there given of the great ends he is pursuing in his present dealings with the race; and had he received the revelation he has made through the prophets of the new dispensation he is soon to institute as the sequel to this, and the beauty and blessedness to which the nations are then to be raised, he would have escaped his difficulties, and in place of doubt, unbelief, despair, and an open and daring traduction of God's attributes and providence, would have found himself invested with a flood of light from the opened heavens, and raised to a rapture of peace, love, adoration, and joy.

Dr. B., however, is not alone in rejecting these great teachings of the Bible, and substituting a device of man's wisdom in their place. There is a considerable class who not only deny that this dispensation is preparatory to another, and that there is to be any other in which the redemption of men is to be continued; but who hold that no explanation is given in the word of God, or is discoverable by reason

of the great measures of his government over men, by which, on the one hand, he puts them to such a trial of their hearts, allows them to sin as they do, and punishes them for their offences; and on the other, by which he subjects those who profess his name to such terrible tests of their fidelity, and causes them to show in such decisive forms whether they are truly his children or not; but maintain that his whole procedure is a dark and inexplicable enigma, apparently, in many of its features at least, at utter war with wisdom and benevolence, and that we must therefore, often against the most decisive appearances to the contrary, take it for granted that it is right, and kneel down in unquestioning and *blind* submission. This theory is scarcely a less gross accusation of God than Dr. B.'s, and is, like his, at open war with the plain teachings of his word, and with the dictates of reason and conscience. To deny that we have any evidence of the righteousness, wisdom, and benevolence of God in the great measures of his moral and providential administration over men, and maintain that if we submit to them as just and wise, it must be in pitch darkness, is equivalent to denying that we have any evidence whatever of God's rectitude, wisdom, and goodness. For if they are not exhibited in the great measures of his moral and providential rule, they plainly are not anywhere; as all other things—the material worlds and their furniture—are merely subservient to them. Even that there are events that affect the condition of individuals, of the reasons of the appointment or permission of which, rather than others, we know nothing; such as the date of one's birth, the death of one in childhood, of another in youth, and of others in middle or old age; is no proof that they are involved in impenetrable darkness, and are to be received in a blind submission. Though the particular reasons of *their* appointment are unknown, yet we have, *in other parts of his administration*, ample evidence of God's infinite righteousness, wisdom, and goodness, and are therefore to regard him as just and good in respect to those particular events, because of our knowledge from other sources, that justice and goodness are general characteristics of his agency. An act of absolutely blind submission is indeed a self-contradiction, and is impossible; and if it were practicable, would be infinitely reproachful to God, in place of being

honorable to him; as it would imply that there was an utter absence of everything in his procedure that can rationally be made the ground of a submissive homage.

But this notion that the great measures of God's government over the world are wholly inexplicable, is at war with the plain teachings of his word, as well as with his attributes. That the Bible everywhere represents that God exercises his government over men for the purpose of manifesting and enforcing his rights, and putting them to a probation of their dispositions towards him, no man needs be told. That he everywhere represents the great judgments with which he punishes wicked nations and individuals, as designed to manifest his displeasure at their sins, to verify his rights, to bring them to know that he is Jehovah, and to cause them to show whether they will return to him or not, no one who has read it with attention can have failed to see. And that they everywhere teach that his children are subjected to the most severe and decisive trials, that it may be shown by indisputable evidence that they are truly his, in order to their receiving a crown, is equally indisputable; and that these great measures are measures of justice, wisdom, and goodness, and are directed to the most essential and momentous ends, is as little open to debate. No one who contemplates them with a tolerable share of attention and intelligence can avoid seeing that they are absolutely indispensable in order to the manifestation of the views with which he regards the conduct of his creatures, and the vindication of himself from the suspicion that he proceeds on false grounds in his judgment of them, and distribution to them of their final awards. Let it be supposed that God had inflicted no judgments on the nations which apostatized to idol worship in expression of his anger at their rebellion, but had allowed them to go on to the present hour in impunity, and crowned them with uninterrupted prosperity, would not these nations themselves naturally have attributed their security and happiness to the false gods whom they worshipped, and regarded the blessings they enjoyed under their imagined sway as proofs of the propriety and acceptableness of their worship? Would it not, to spectators of other worlds, have seemed also to imply God's approval of, or, at least, indifference to their conduct? Would not such an omission, through a long tract of ages, to



enforce his law have been in appearance equivalent to an abandonment of it, and surrender of the sceptre of the world? Would it not have been natural for men and angels to ask: If God is not indifferent to the course which these nations pursue, why does he not use some means to bring them to a sense of their sins? Why does he not cause the penal consequences which his law denounces, to follow in the train of their offences, that it may be seen whether, under their impulse, they will not return to allegiance? Let it be supposed that God had not varied his providence towards the Israelites on their revolting to idol worship, but had continued to bestow on them, from generation to generation, the same blessings as he did during their obedience, would they not naturally have interpreted it as the work of their false deities, and as a demonstration of the wisdom of their apostasy from Jehovah? Would not God's omitting in that manner to take any notice of the revolt of his people, or make any discrimination between the obedient and rebellious, have given occasion to the feeling, in all spectators, whether in this world or in others, that he was indifferent to his rights, had abandoned the enforcement of his law, and treated sin as being as sure a passport as obedience to his favor? Let it be supposed that God had omitted to chastise the Christian church for its offences; that uninterrupted favor had been shown to all who entered it from age to age, notwithstanding their sins as individuals and their apostasy as a body, would not the church have regarded it as expressive of his approbation? Would it not have led inevitably to the inference that the idol worship, the invocation of saints, the celibacy, the homage of the mass, the false doctrines and profligate manners that have prevailed and given character to the church, were indeed—what the Greek and Roman communions claim—essential parts of Christianity itself, and its most obligatory elements? No one can fail to see that that would have been the result inevitably of such a course. It would, in the eyes of the whole universe, have been equivalent to a public abandonment of his law, and a treatment of rebellion as though it was as acceptable to him as obedience. The avenging judgments with which he has stricken the nations, the chastenings with which he has smitten the church, have thus been indispensable to his own protection

from the suspicion and charge of approving and favoring the sins which he prohibits: they have been essential, indeed, to his exercising a moral government. Had he omitted them, he would in effect have given up his rule. They have been the great means through which he has asserted and vindicated his rights, they have been the effective measures through which he has made known his displeasure at the sins of the nations and of his people. It has been by them that he has brought them often to a sense of their offences, and caused them, in all instances, to show whether they would return to allegiance, or go on incorrigibly in rebellion.

We have the most ample proofs, therefore, of the righteousness, wisdom, and goodness of God, in these great measures of his government. They present some of the clearest and most impressive displays of his perfections; and without them, indeed, his moral glories would have been shrouded in impenetrable darkness. No wonder that they who see nothing of these characteristics in his administration, regard his government as an inexplicable enigma, and contemplate him as an arbitrary despot, who saves or destroys his creatures for reasons of which we have no knowledge; and who suppose, therefore, that the only homage that can be acceptable to him, is one in which abject terror and blind submission have the predominance. No wonder that they see nothing brighter in the future than the midnight gloom that, according to them, has filled the past; that they deny that Christ is ever to reign on the earth; and that a redemption of the race from the thralldom of sin is ever to take place: and persuade themselves that the termination to which the present system is hastening, the great expedient by which the Almighty is to close this tragedy of sin and woe, is the annihilation of the world itself, an end of the multiplication of the race, the burial of its lost myriads from the eye of the universe in the abyss of perdition, and the removal of the small number that are saved to some distant sphere, that oblivion may, as far as possible, drop her sable pall over the horrors of which the earth has been the theatre!—a theory of much the same brood as that of Dr. Beecher, that God already has once struck from the minds of men the consciousness and knowledge of their first existence, and veiled

the events on which their everlasting destiny was made to turn in impenetrable mystery. They, in fact, pay as little heed to the great teachings of the divine word, they make their own arbitrary preconceptions as much the standard by which they judge of God and the ends he is pursuing, as Dr. Beecher himself does. These and all other antimillenarians will necessarily continue involved in darkness and perplexity as long as they persist in neglecting or perverting the prophetic Scriptures, in which the great purposes God is accomplishing are unveiled; deny that this dispensation is preparatory to another; and shut from their faith and hope the final redemption of the world from the effects of the apostasy and restoration to the perfection and bliss of an unfallen sphere, as the great ends of Christ's interposition. That is the scheme which God himself proclaims he is pursuing. That is the work in which all his attributes blend in harmony, and shine forth in their infinite effulgence: that is the joyous issue to which he points the enraptured expectation and trust of his children: and it is that and that alone that clears up all difficulties, and invests his ways, otherwise dark and inexplicable, with the dazzling light of boundless righteousness, wisdom, and love.

---

ART. IV.—WOULD IT BE PRUDENT TO ATTEMPT THE  
REFUTATION OF MILLENARIANISM?

BY THE REV. H. CARLETON.

It was certainly commendable in the ancient Romans not to deliver any man to die before he, who was accused, had the accusers face to face; and license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him. The principle involved in this custom is essential to the existence of all correctly constituted and properly conducted courts, whether civil or ecclesiastical. The common law of England, which is the basis of the jurisprudence in most of the States in this Union, suffers no man to be condemned as a criminal, with-

out a trial; and it acknowledges no process as a trial, unless the crime alleged, and the circumstances, so far as may be, are clearly and definitively stated, a copy thereof given, at his request, to the accused, and he have a reasonable time to prepare a defence, and liberty to defend himself, without let or hindrance. This is right. For this right Englishmen and Americans are ready to contend even unto blood.

But as the Jews, in the time when Christ was on earth, were accustomed to limit the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," to the act of killing from malice aforethought, so it may be that in these days there is a disposition to confine the right of a fair hearing, touching all matters affecting reputation or welfare, to processes in courts; whereas the privilege should be as sacredly regarded in private conduct as in public trials.

There are many crimes or misdemeanors of which civil courts do not take cognizance, which render a man liable to censure from ecclesiastical tribunals; and there are many things which prejudice the reputation of a man as a Christian and a Christian minister, which are not regarded as belonging to the class of offences which render a man liable to be tried in a formal manner for immorality or heresy.

The church, by formal acts of discipline, cannot free itself from all immoral or heretical persons. And it is unquestionably better to leave many things to the healthful influence of private admonition or friendly discussion; and yet by being considered culpable in respect to these same things, a person would lose a fair standing in Christian society, or have fixed upon him the very undesirable reputation of an errorist or visionary theorist. By thus being convicted in the common estimation of Christians he suffers in his reputation, is wounded in his feelings, and made incapable of occupying any responsible position. Before a man is thus censured in the common opinion of a Christian community, he should, at least when he asks it, be permitted to answer in an appropriate way to the charges brought against him, and he has a right to demand a clear proof of his alleged delinquencies, or refutation of his reputed errors or eccentricities.

There are many methods by which a man may be made to endure very severe suffering without a formal decree of

a civil or ecclesiastical court. In this country there are many benevolent societies, whose agents travel and visit all important places. They are the honored guests of ministers and leading members of churches, and are highly esteemed for the sake of the societies for which they labor; and very many of them are worthy of a high regard for their abilities and exemplary piety.

Let it be supposed that a doctrine is received by some ministers and laymen, which is considered erroneous by the prudential committees and directors of these societies. It may be reasonably expected that they will employ agents who sympathize with them. How easy would it be for these agents, by a few remarks, in which they really intended no personal injury, and only meant to give a friendly notice of an existing evil, to bring into disrepute all persons who believe the offensive doctrine. In this secret manner a sentence of condemnation may be delivered to the ear of the influential part of the church, which will be as effectual as a decree of an ecclesiastical council, or synod, or general assembly. This is manifestly wrong, and subversive of the rights of Americans and Christians, unless the doctrine reputed erroneous be successfully controverted. When this is done errorists have no reason to complain, if their orthodoxy is questioned, and if they are regarded as unsafe men.

These suggestions are made with reference to the course pursued towards millenarians, and the doctrine by which they are distinguished.

Notwithstanding a very decided dislike to the doctrine, and impatience towards those who hold it, has been manifested by persons of high consideration in the churches, there has not as yet been in this country an attempt to refute the one or convince the other in a fair discussion, or by arguments drawn from the sacred Scriptures. We think we may safely say, that never in any article written against millenarianism, has there been a fair and candid statement of it, and of the arguments or reasons, from a consideration of which many have adopted it as an article of their Christian faith. To meet the subject fairly, and to give its advocates a fair trial at the bar of a Christian community, the doctrine should be accurately given, distinct

from the inferences which some say are to be legitimately drawn from it, together with the Scriptures, which are supposed to teach it, and the principles of interpretation which its advocates adopt. As much as this would be required of a prosecuting officer who should arraign a fellow citizen before a court of justice, to be tried for a violation of the laws of his country. All this may reasonably be expected of an opponent; and without it, it is not affirming too much to say, no attempt has been made to meet the subject. The natural right, to be permitted to meet the accuser face to face, and to answer to the errors alleged, is trampled upon. To shun a fair discussion, while, at the same time, an attempt is made to prejudice the Christian church against a respectable portion of the brotherhood, on account of an alleged error, is wrong, is cruel, is tyrannical. And every American, every Protestant, should repudiate a practice so radically opposed to the principles of civil and religious liberty, which he cherishes as the birthright of an American, and a gift of God, which is not to be alienated for any cause whatever. Should any person think our statement too broad, let him refer us to one article in which the doctrine has been fairly stated—one article in which the principles of interpretation adopted by millenarians have been truly given—one article in which there has been a presentation of the Scriptures which are supposed to teach the doctrine, together with the reasons for deriving it from them. Have we required too much from our opponents? We are willing to concede all this to those who differ from us, and will say we do no more than it is our duty to do. We are willing to give propositions, arguments, Scriptures, applications of Scriptures, and rules of interpretation in their own language, and we will not put our inferences in the place of their own statement of their doctrines.

We think we hazard nothing in saying that antimillenarians have not yet done this.

Furthermore there has been manifested an unwillingness to be drawn into an open and friendly discussion with millenarians. The method of opposition has been to avoid controversy through the press, and to bring into requisition a private influence which large majorities always have at their command, by which it is hoped that the doctrine will

be held in check so securely, that it will spread no further. There are no replies to articles written by millenarians, even when a reply has been furnished once and again. Why this singular procedure? Is it because of an unwillingness to enter into controversy with brethren? There are facts which show that this supposition is groundless, and facts, too, which clearly indicate that courage is not always with the largest company, and that sometimes one, even a feeble one, may chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight.

There is a proverbial saying that there are no general rules without some exceptions. And certainly there may be many and forcible reasons why millenarianism should not be openly opposed, that an attempt should not be made to show that it is a false doctrine. No one can doubt that we should exercise prudence in all our actions; and we apprehend that it would be manifestly imprudent to engage in a discussion with millenarians to prove the doctrine by which they are distinguished, unscriptural and absurd. The following suggestions will, we trust, show the propriety of what we here state in respect to our opponents.

I. The proof of the truth of a divinely constituted church is identified with that of the doctrine of millenarianism.

Our opponents would not wish to pursue a course which would have a tendency to weaken in the minds of the Christian community, the conviction that there is a divinely constituted church, built upon the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. We think we know that they love the church, and that it is more precious to them than every earthly thing, yea than their own life. Why, then, should they not hesitate to enter into a controversy in which, to maintain their position, it would be necessary to say many things which would as certainly prove the church to be a human institution, as they would successfully controvert the positions of their opponents? A victory under such circumstances would be a most deplorable ruin.

The church of Christ is composed of persons who are bound together by a common faith, and who acknowledge him as their head, and each other as brethren. It is not constituted by the mere act of association, but the association is the appropriate result of a true unity anterior to any

external organization. It is built not upon  $\pi\tau\tau\eta\eta$ , as the Catholics would have it, but upon  $\pi\tau\tau\eta$ : and consequently has an immovable faith for its foundation, as the symbol would indicate, and not a changeable man, who is appropriately represented by  $\pi\tau\tau\eta\varsigma$ , a movable rock, a boulder.

Since, therefore, the church is constituted by being united by a common faith, which recognises Christ as the saviour, priest, and king, there must, of necessity, be certain truths or facts which are objects of faith, and which relate to Christ and his work as the Saviour.

Yea more, there must be elements in the doctrine of Christ which are essential to it, and cannot be separated from it. There is a faith which was taught by apostles and prophets, and which is a bond of union among the disciples of Christ; otherwise we have no evidence that he has constituted a church. Indeed the Scriptures teach that all who have the true faith are, like Abraham's seed, heirs according to the promise—that they belong to the general assembly of the first born. A belief in the true faith, then, constitutes a person a member of the true church. And as the visible church is the external or formal organization of true believers or members of the true church, that organization must necessarily recognise the faith by which its members are united. And if the organization is of divine authority, much more is the faith on which it rests from God. And if the latter be not of God, then it would follow that the former has not his sanction.

The first churches were constituted or organized by the apostles of our Lord, who sent them forth to preach the word. As many as believed the word which they preached, on being baptized, became members of the visible body of Christ, the church. The apostles acted under the express authority of the Saviour, who assured them that "whatever they should bind on earth, should be bound in heaven, and whatsoever they should loose on earth should be loosed in heaven." In doing the work which was assigned them, they were more constantly employed in preaching the truth, a belief of which constitutes a person a disciple of Christ, than in arranging and perfecting any particular organization of believers into churches. We trust this will be readily conceded. If they left either to perfect itself or shape itself



according to the circumstances of the times, it is certain that they did not leave the promulgation of the doctrine in this unfinished and uncertain state.

What, then, was the faith of the apostolic churches? It will be proper to remark in this place, that we do not contend that there was a perfect agreement among all the members of the apostolic churches respecting every article of religious doctrine. We know that disputes and even dissensions did arise respecting many subjects. There can be no doubt that many erroneous opinions were adopted by individual members of churches. But it can hardly be supposed that the members of all the churches were united in receiving, as an essential element of the true orthodox faith, an absurd superstition conceived by worldly-minded Jews who loved the pleasures of sense more than God. Our Saviour said to his disciples, "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." And certainly neither did he nor his apostles spare the pernicious traditions with which the Jews attempted to encumber the true faith. It was a part of the work of the apostles to separate the truth from the errors of the Jews. And we must not suppose that they did their work deceitfully or only partially. What remained in the churches and was received in all of them as a part of the revelation which God gave to man by prophets and apostles and by his Son from heaven, must be regarded as the truth of God; else we should find it difficult to retain in our minds the conviction that the apostles acted under the divine direction in the institution of the churches.

Should it be urged that the apostles were faithful to him who appointed them to their office, but were not able to dissuade the members of the churches from a long-cherished belief, we should still be prepared with this thought: They were appointed to their work by a Divine Master, who promised to be with them in their work, and who further promised them the assistance of the Holy Spirit. Had it not been for the divine power which accompanied their labors, they would have planted and watered in vain. Yea, they would have spent their strength for naught. The work which they were commissioned to do was done, not by their own power, but by the power of God. And if through the divine

power a church was formed, based upon a revealed faith, we should find it difficult to persuade ourselves that that power succeeded in securing a belief of that which is true and a rejection of that which is false, in respect to some parts of the creed of the churches, while some erroneous notions had so firmly possessed the minds of all that they could not be rooted out.

It is a clearly established fact that the apostolic churches were millenarian in respect to the reign of Christ on earth with the saints. There is undoubted evidence of this fact. According to Justin Martyr, all right thinking or orthodox Christians received the doctrine. And certainly he was competent to testify respecting what was believed in the time of the apostles. And with his statements the whole history of the church, in its first days, coincided. There are three facts here to be noted :

1. The entire orthodox church was united in receiving the doctrine.
2. Christians believed that it was taught by prophets and apostles.
3. A person was not regarded as a right-thinking Christian who did not receive it.

How could such a fact have existed in divinely-constituted churches, unless the doctrine were itself a part of that system of revealed truth upon which the church was built? The apostles must have known what the members of the churches did believe on the subject. They must have known that it was supposed that it had been taught by the prophets. They must have known that it was made a test of orthodoxy. Is it to be supposed that they would have suffered a Jewish fable to obtain such a place in the creed of the churches? If we search the Scriptures, we are not able to find one instance in which Christ or his apostles spoke a word against the doctrine in question. And more than this, it cannot, we think, be denied that, in many instances, they used language which implies that they themselves believed it. We do not know what others may think, but we must say that we cannot conceive it possible that the churches should have given the doctrine of the personal reign of Christ so much prominence in their religious creed as they did give it, without apostolic authority. If so, the churches

were planted partly by the apostles and partly by some other teachers; and were constituted in part by divine authority and in part by human folly, or were wholly of a human origin.

If millenarianism were not taught to the churches by divine teachers, who did communicate it to them?

It may be said that it was taught by Jewish converts who were disposed to engraft upon the churches many Jewish ceremonies and traditions.

We know very well that Jewish converts were very much under the influence of early associations and prejudices, and were encouraged by pretended teachers, who would pervert the gospel. But the apostles of our Lord neither encouraged those false notions, nor spared the corrupt teachers. The apostle Paul said, "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Let it be noted here, that in rebuking the Judaizing teachers, the apostle brings out the fact that the same doctrines which he with other apostles had preached, had been received by the churches; that the disciples who had been brought to a knowledge of the truth did receive the doctrines that were taught by them. If some were led away, and finally were organized as heretical sects, the orthodox church nevertheless remained steadfast in the "faith once delivered to the saints."

But admitting that the Jews, biased by former prejudices and national sympathies, followed false teachers rather than the apostles of Christ, from whom did the Gentile converts obtain the doctrine of the personal reign of Christ with the risen saints? They certainly had no old prejudices to lead them into it; but on the contrary, the doctrine of the resurrection itself was opposed to their philosophical pride, and they received it only from a divine revelation. Did they imbibe the notion from the Jewish portion of the church? The Gentile part of the church were very far from receiving readily anything which was essentially Jewish. Indeed, the differences which arose between Jews and Gentiles growing out of former habits and opinions, go very far to prove that

those doctrines which were universally received must have been delivered to them by divine authority.

If the churches planted by the apostles were united in the conviction of the truth of a particular doctrine, and also in the opinion that it had been taught by the apostles themselves, and all the prophets since the world began, which, instead of being a doctrine of Christ, was a gross error, fabricated by the worldly mind at the instigation of the devil, we cannot be assured that they, in a right manner, received any part of the Christian system, and, consequently, the question of their divine institution would be left in doubt. For it should be remembered that the divine institution of the churches involves their being rooted and grounded in the faith as much as a correct organization as an associated company.

An effort to make it appear that the apostolic churches were instituted by divine authority, while they all received, without hesitation or doubt, the doctrine of millenarians, even on the supposition that that is a false doctrine, would be attended with consequences which all persons who love the doctrines of grace would wish to avoid. If the institution of the churches were left by the apostles in an imperfect or unfinished state, some provision must have been made for completing the work which they began, or else it was the design of Christ that it should be but partially accomplished; that his disciples should never be able to arrive at a certain knowledge of truth. If additions and corrections were to be made, in what manner were they to be accomplished? The most natural solution of this difficulty would be to suppose that there is a succession, in the apostolic office, of inspired men, so that, in successive generations, the truth of God is revealed as men are able to receive it. This doctrine would be very agreeable to Romanists. And, indeed, it would be difficult to conceive how errors allowed by inspired apostles could be eradicated, or imperfect truths not revealed by them communicated to the churches, unless by men of at least equal authority. Shall the difficulty be solved in this way? Our opponents would not wish to turn advocates of the pretensions of the church of Rome. And besides, the difficulty could not be removed in this way; for if a pernicious error was taught, or suffered to be made an essential element in

the Christian faith, by the first persons of the apostolic order, we could never know whether the received standards of the church were according to truth or not.

But perhaps it may be urged that the provision for perfecting the constitution of the church is not in any particular order of men, but in the whole body of believers. We have in this supposition the poison of Romanism. The advocates of the papal authority were never able to agree in respect to the question where the infallibility of the church rests, whether with the pope, or with the pope and cardinals, or with councils. The error is not in placing the infallibility in the wrong place, but in making uninspired men infallible, and of equal or even greater authority in the church than the apostles of our Lord. Those do this who assume that the work of the apostles was to be completed, corrected, and perfected by persons comprising the church in succeeding generations. It is perfectly absurd to suppose that Origen could in his day more clearly understand the divine will and place the church on a better foundation, without a revelation, than the apostles of our Lord could with one. And it were equally absurd to presume the same respecting any persons or any number of persons in any age.

There is an opinion which is making much progress at the present time, which seems to have sprung up with the idea of the surpassing superiority of the men of the present century, to any who have lived before us. It may be said to have its religious and its atheistic form, and attempts have been made to accommodate Christianity to it. It is this; the world or earth, with its inhabitants, from a principle of development, or growth, or progress towards perfection, is continually assuming new and more perfect forms, and advancing to a higher and more desirable state; and this is a law of matter and of animated beings, and especially of man. This theory places the creative power in matter itself, and, divested of all deceitful names, is Pantheism. Those who would accommodate Christianity to this mode of philosophizing, suppose that Christianity is like leaven cast into the mass of humanity, and by its operation is assimilating the world to itself, and consequently is in every successive generation presenting a purer faith, and a more perfect organization of the brotherhood in a visible form or church.

The atheistic and Christian philosophers, who speculate after this manner, are so nearly allied to each other, that it were difficult to distinguish between them. Not many years since we heard a lecture from a clergyman of distinction in the class to which he belongs. His subject was conservatism and progression; and he boldly advocated the notion that what was true to one age was not true to another; that the truth to one age was to the truth of the next succeeding age as the shell is to the chicken. According to this theory there is no established truth, and indeed nothing true, for at the moment when truth should really be truth, it is antiquated and gives place to something else which appears as if it would become truth, but which, like its predecessor, turns out to be nothing more than a shell. Thus the world goes on ever learning, yet never able to come to the knowledge of the truth, simply because there is no truth to be learnt. Will our opponents attempt to explain by the operation of this law of progress, how it was that the error or heresy of millenarianism was allowed in the apostolic churches, but was exploded and found to be a miserable Jewish conceit in after generations? We trust that our orthodox opponents would not wish to wield such a dangerous weapon against us and the doctrine we advocate. They would sooner be associated with some millenarians, though somewhat deluded, than see the foundations destroyed. It is, therefore, prudent to let us alone, lest, in their effort to prove us in error, they should offend against the generation of the children of God.

And besides, it would be rather difficult to show that there has been a gradual improvement in divine knowledge and piety, or even in anything which essentially belongs to humanity. There have been improvements in science and in the arts. Books have been greatly multiplied, and the facilities for acquiring knowledge increased. But when pressed to tell wherein, physically, intellectually, or morally, the race has improved, it would be difficult to give a satisfactory answer. The human frame is not now stronger, larger, more athletic, than it was in the days of David and Saul, or in the last days of Greece and Rome. The human mind is not more capacious, more vigorous, now, than when Homer, Socrates, Plato, Job, Isaiah, and Daniel lived. And

there is not a better state of morals in England now than there was in the time of Cromwell, nor in this country than there was during the first century of its existence,—nor in the islands that have been recently Christianized, than there was ten years ago. It is presumed it will not be denied that in the Society Islands and even in the Sandwich Islands, the morals of the natives are rapidly deteriorating. It could not be easily shown that there was an increase of piety and divine knowledge in the church from the first or second century to the fourteenth.

There has been a partial reform in some countries since that period. But no one will pretend that in France, or Germany, or Switzerland, or Scotland, or even in England, there has been any improvement in theological knowledge and true devotion to Christ, since the age which immediately succeeded the reformation. We say no one. We mean no orthodox man, for it is presumed that Unitarians, Universalists, and Arminians and Pelagians, will not admit what is here affirmed. Let us compare the extreme parts of the Christian period—the first with the last—the reformation in the time of the apostles with the reformation in the time of Calvin, Luther, Zwingli, and those who followed them, down to the present time. Will any one pretend that the reformed churches were equal to apostolic churches in divine knowledge, in fervent and consistent piety, in being separated from the world, and in a hearty and cheerful devotion to Christ? Are Christians more liberal now than then? Do they more cheerfully give of their abundance than early Christians did out of their extreme poverty? Is there a more earnest, more pure, more self-denying, missionary spirit in the English or American churches than there was in the first Christian churches? Indeed it would be difficult to tell where the much boasted progress is to be found.

II. The proof of the authenticity of the Scriptures, and of the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, as it is usually presented by orthodox Christians, involves the truth of millenarianism.

Who wrote the books comprised in the New Testament? In some of the books the author's name is given, or some allusions are made by the author to himself, by which it is

easy to determine who he was. But it would be objected by those who deny that the sacred books were written by the persons to whom they are generally ascribed, that it would be very easy for a writer to attach the name of some other person to his book. How, then, is the question of authorship determined? It is determined by the testimony of the early fathers of the church, in connexion with such internal evidence as is furnished by the books themselves.

The same is true respecting the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week; and also of the rite of infant baptism.

We, indeed, learn from the sacred Scriptures that the Christian churches were accustomed to assemble on the first day of the week for worship. And it is a significant fact that our Saviour, after his resurrection, was accustomed to show himself to his disciples on that day. But neither our Saviour nor his inspired apostles gave any commandment which is left on record respecting the change. There is, indeed, allusion to the custom of assembling on the first day of the week, as already established, while the apostles were living. But it would be difficult to find any hint that the Lord's day was to take the place of the ancient Sabbath. Yet the argument for the change is deemed to be good, and we have no doubt of its validity. It is this: The apostles were commissioned and duly qualified by the guidance of the Holy Spirit to establish churches and to institute customs, and to make known the will of God. Churches formed by them, and acting under their immediate direction, did assemble for worship on the first day of the week. This became an established custom of the church, as we learn from the writings of the fathers, by whom we are informed that the churches had received it from apostolic instruction, that it was the will of God that the Sabbath, or day of rest, should be transferred to the first day of the week, as the Lord's day.

All this is true to the fullest extent respecting the doctrine of the personal reign of Christ on earth with his saints. The apostles of our Lord believed in the doctrine, certainly at the time when, at his ascension, he met them and gave them charge respecting their future labors. In his conversation with them the subject came up, and what he said



was directly calculated to confirm them in their belief of the doctrine; and what was said by the angels respecting the future coming of Christ, seems expressly to have been designed to give them assurance of the truth of what they had believed, even though contrary to their expectation,—their Lord had departed from them into heaven. All we find in the writings of the apostles relating to the subject seems, at least, to assume millenarianism as an established fact of revelation. But what say the fathers respecting this subject? They affirm in the most positive manner that this doctrine was received as true by the orthodox church; that they were taught it by prophets and apostles, and they speak of it as a fact not called in question.

Since these are facts, which cannot be successfully controverted, those who deny that millenarianism is a doctrine of revelation, must admit that it is impossible to determine who were the authors of the books of the New Testament, or to prove that the Sabbath was transferred from the seventh to the first day of the week, or that infant baptism should be practised in the churches. We say, therefore, that it would not be prudent for our orthodox opponents to assail our doctrine openly.

It may be said the sacred Scriptures are the only rule of faith and practice, and we should not be influenced in our interpretation of them by the opinions and practices of even apostolic churches. We answer that we would be willing to rest the proof of the truth of millenarianism on the plain and obvious declarations of Scripture, even if we knew nothing what the early Christians believed respecting it. But yet, we think that there is a propriety in our alluding to the creed of the primitive church. An attempt has been made to stigmatize us as guilty of bringing in a new doctrine, and it is insinuated that we are heretical. On the other hand, millenarians are conservative almost to a man. They seem to have, as it were, a constitutional horror of new things, or even the appearance of departure from the old path, "the faith once delivered to the saints," against which the gates of hell have not prevailed, and which, as a pure stream, has retained its purity, though the mud and filth of Popery and Origenism has been on either bank. It is perfectly natural that we should be a little sensitive,

therefore, and that we should wish to show that our faith was the faith of the church in its best days.

In respect to this subject, we should carefully distinguish between what was received from divine authority by the apostolic churches, and what subsequently came into them by the gradual operation of the corrupt philosophy of Pagans, and the cravings of an ungodly ambition and sensuality,—between an article of faith universally adopted and made a test of orthodoxy, and the individual opinion of any number of professed Christians,—between a statement of fact, and the individual opinion of a teacher or writer,—between a concurrence of the opinions of the fathers and the obvious meaning of Scripture, and the absolute authority of the creed of the first churches, independent of all considerations drawn from the sacred writings. But if we are in no manner to be influenced by the opinions of the fathers, and if the universal adoption by the churches, under the care of the apostles, of a doctrine, should have no influence with us in determining what is taught in Scripture, be it so; millenarians can do without such aid; but let it be remembered that to deny the force of the argument drawn from the undivided opinion of the churches in their best days in favor of millenarianism would be equivalent to an assertion that the authenticity of the Scriptures, and the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, and infant baptism, cannot be determined or proved. We, therefore, suggest that opposition on the part of orthodox Christians would not be prudent. The authenticity of the Scriptures is connected intimately with their credibility. And certainly our opponents would not have their faith shaken respecting the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. They love the Sabbath, the Lord's day, and would by no means have it regarded as a human institution. And very many would believe that they may bring their infant children to Christ in the solemn rite of baptism, and that he accepts the offering.

III. Orthodox Christians, by opposing millenarianism, place themselves in the awkward position of supporting not only a new and strange doctrine, but a doctrine in direct opposition to the faith of the early churches, and associate themselves with the most hurtful theorists, who have introduced the most dangerous errors into the church. It will

not be necessary to prove the first part of this proposition, for we trust that it will be admitted that apostolic churches were millenarian, and that opposition to this doctrine did not commence until two centuries after the first churches were planted. But why need orthodox Christians be troubled about upholding a new doctrine, and one which is in opposition to the faith of the church in its best days? Orthodoxy assumes that there was a "faith once delivered to the saints;" that the faith of the church is ever the same, and is not a thing which accommodates itself to the fancies of men in every age. Orthodoxy does not readily admit a companionship with the notion that Christian doctrines, as taught by the Saviour and his apostles, were partially true and partially erroneous; that these teachers were but the exponents of their age, an age much inferior to our own; that the only churches established by inspired men held a confused jargon of error, in which some truth was intermingled, yet in such proportions that the darkness prevailed over the light, so that the former was so thick that it could be felt, while the latter was so faint and so flickering that it were difficult to determine whether it were a light or not; that Theodore Parker is as much a Saviour in his day as Jesus of Nazareth was in his, and that the other pretended reformers of the present age are as much superior to prophets and apostles as they assume to be.

Orthodoxy assumes that the doctrines of Christ were fixed and unalterable, and were delivered to the first churches in a pure form; that the word of God is light and not darkness; and that the disciples of Christ, in the earliest history of the church, were as truly the children of the light and of the day as any who have ever professed to be the followers of Jesus. In a word, orthodoxy repels innovations upon the ancient faith of the church.

Further than this, orthodox Christians would say that if new light is to be derived from the Scriptures, it will not prove that the early Christians walked in darkness; that nothing has been established as a revealed fact. They are jealous, and should be jealous of new doctrines which do not harmonize with the former undisputed creed of the church. They do not, therefore, prudently oppose millenarianism, for opposition to it was a new doctrine, and came in with other

notions that are extremely heretical. And it is a remarkable fact, that while the doctrine of the personal reign of Christ with his saints on earth has strong sympathies with the doctrines of grace, and seems to be inseparable from them; opposition to it fraternizes with a love of change, with an ever varying creed, a boasted progress of theological knowledge and universal salvation, and those views respecting the dignity of human nature started by Pelagius, maintained by Socinus, perfected by modern Unitarians, and sublimated by Theodore Parker.

When the attention of the churches was first directed to the ancient doctrine concerning the millennium, an attempt was made to ridicule it as an offshoot from Millerism, and by associating its advocates with persons who have manifested a greater degree of fanaticism than of sound theological knowledge. But this attempt was unfortunate, inasmuch as it resulted in calling forth the history of millenarianism and the opposition which has been made against it. History shows that the advocates of the doctrine have been among the best men of the best periods of the church, whereas opposition to it originated with one who may be regarded as the father of Universalism, and the originator of that method of interpretation which has been the chief support of almost, if not quite, all the heresies of modern times. History furthermore shows that the most active opponents of the doctrine have usually been men who have been distinguished rather for their unsoundness in the faith than for their orthodoxy. Neither is this to be regarded as a strange occurrence; for as we shall see, the same method of interpretation by which millenarianism is opposed supports heresy.

IV. Christ will certainly reign on earth with his saints, if the principles of interpretation are correct, by an application of which to the sacred Scriptures the orthodox have successfully maintained their positions against every form of opposition.

There is no ambiguity in the Bible. By a right application of the laws of language in interpreting it, all will arrive at substantially the same conclusions. If the methods of interpreting language adopted by the orthodox be correct, then their doctrines are true, and every professed scholar will admit that they are.

Orthodox interpretations involve these principles, viz:

1. Man has not obtained, nor has he powers of mind by which he will attain, a correct theology without a revelation from God given in human language.

2. The mind is so constituted that we are able clearly to understand the terms of a proposition, and comprehend what is announced in human language, though we are utterly unable to discover the reasons or grounds of it.

3. Inasmuch as our minds are blinded by sin, so that we are induced to put light for darkness and darkness for light, while our powers of understanding language remain,—if not unimpaired, yet entire,—it is absurd to subject the laws of language to the dominant control of philosophy or speculative theology, while interpreting those communications by which God would lead us to a knowledge of the truth.

4. The language of Scripture is to be interpreted according to established laws which are within us, and by which we are made capable of communicating or receiving knowledge by means of speech or human language; and we should never admit a forced construction which, while it utterly disregards these laws, gives a meaning for which no substantial reason can be assigned.

5. If we are not guided by true rules of interpretation, the word of God will be to us contradictory, unintelligible, always uncertain, and, consequently, useless, and we shall still wander in all the dark and deceitful imaginings of a depraved heart and absurd mind.

The orthodox urge upon their opponents that so long as it is admitted that the Bible is the word of God, it should be regarded as the only sure rule of faith; and that it is manifestly improper to subject the interpretation of it to the ruling power of what the depraved mind conceives to be true philosophy or reason; and so long as they stand upon this foundation, they are not shaken by the storms of philosophy or the whirlwinds of fanaticism. By the same method of interpretation, millenarianism is clearly derived from the sacred Scriptures; and should our opponents succeed in proving that we are in error, they would ruin themselves by destroying their hopes of future blessedness. By the rules of language by which the doctrine of the divinity of Christ is proved from the Bible, his future personal reign on earth

with the saints is established. By an application of the same laws of language to the sacred Scriptures, they teach with great force the resurrection of the body and the resurrection of the saints at the commencement of the millennium, the future and everlasting punishment of wicked men when Christ shall appear to set up his kingdom, the personality of the Holy Spirit, and the reign of the saints on earth with Christ during the thousand years. Millenarians ask for no new methods of interpretation, neither do they contend for one principle of language for historic, and another for prophetic, and another for didactic Scriptures. They believe the laws of interpretation are inseparable from language itself, and the mind when seeking to understand its import; otherwise, the words of an author would be as senseless as "the sounding brass or tinkling cymbal."

Should it be supposed that what we have affirmed under this topic could not be verified, it will be necessary to refer only to a few passages to show that we have not said more than the truth will warrant. The Scriptures teach that Christ will come in the clouds of heaven, and often speak of his appearing to set up his kingdom on the earth. If anti-millenarians should succeed in showing that these passages refer to the power of the Lord displayed at the destruction of Jerusalem, or to the future establishment of his kingdom on earth, they use arguments which might be made to bear equally well against the personal appearing of Christ at any future time. The Scriptures teach that Christ, when he shall set up his kingdom, will break the heathen with a rod of iron, and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel; that he "shall consume the man of sin with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming." If these and like Scriptures mean conversion instead of destruction, so that the greatest blessing is indicated by language which naturally describes the most extreme ruin and woe, why may it not with equal propriety be supposed that when the Bible calls Christ God it teaches that he is man? when it affirms that the wicked "shall go away into everlasting punishment," and that they shall "suffer the vengeance of eternal fire," the meaning is that they shall go away into everlasting blessedness, and that they shall enjoy the favor of eternal love? Certainly, when language is made to signify the op-

posite from what it is always in all other instances made to represent, and that, too, without any other reason than to prevent a favorite theory from being disproved, the errorist and heretic may use the Scriptures to prove their dogmas with as much success as the orthodox do to prove what they receive for truth. We think, therefore, that it would not be prudent to attempt to show that millenarians reason falsely or put a wrong construction upon the Scriptures, or that their principles of interpretation are vicious. The truth of the orthodox creed is involved in this question; and may we not suppose that, because this is understood, our opponents are exceedingly unwilling to make the least attempt to show that the rules we adopt are unsound? Certainly prudence forbids it.

V. It would be a work of much labor and difficulty to attempt the disproval of millenarianism in a fair controversy with its friends.

In a theological controversy, those whose opinions are supported by the plain and obvious sense of Scripture have a much easier task than their opponents. They need only to quote the passages which refer to the subject under consideration, and the conviction instantly possesses the mind that their doctrine is proved. They are not under the necessity of making out a long, tedious, metaphysical argument, so subtle that it cannot be easily understood. They need only state definitely what they believe, and refer to Scripture for proof. This is a short and easy work, and the doctrine, with the proof of it, is received by the mind from the same point of view.

But their opponents,—who must derive the proof of their doctrines from the Scriptures by inferences which are so remote from the particular fact taught that it is with the utmost difficulty that it can be conceived how any person could ever have supposed them legitimate, and must meet the arguments of their opponents by showing that the obvious meaning is not the true sense of the passages quoted,—have a long and difficult work. Moreover, their work is not only arduous, but it is often very unsatisfactory. We are so constituted that we very unwillingly concede that an author says exactly the contrary to that which we naturally suppose he has said, when taking his language in its most obvious

sense, or the opposite of what we should mean should we use his language. Those, therefore, who attempt to maintain a position contrary to the obvious meaning of Scripture will often find that their arguments, however ingenious, are far from being satisfactory.

Such would be the work of those who should oppose millenarians. It is easy to say that Christ will appear and destroy the man of sin at the commencement of the millennium, for the Scripture says—"And then shall that wicked be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." But it would be a long work to show that this is only a spiritual coming, and the conversion of men, and not a destruction; or that Christ will destroy the man of sin at his appearing after the millennium, since the man of sin must have existed and have been destroyed before that period will commence. It is easy to say that the saints will reign on the earth, for the Scriptures expressly teach that they will; and in another passage it is said "they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." But it were a long and difficult, and, we apprehend, an unsatisfactory work, to show that here is no allusion to the saints who have fallen asleep in Jesus, but that pious men who will be like them are designated. By these examples the nature of the work of the opponents of millenarians is indicated; and here, unquestionably, we see one reason why millenarians are ready and willing to meet those who oppose them in a friendly discourse; and also, why their opponents are unwilling to meet fairly the subject in dispute. We must commend them for their prudence, for being ourselves "constitutionally biased," *i.e.* naturally averse, with the rest of mankind, to strenuous exertion, we should certainly be unwilling to undertake such an endless and unsatisfactory work.

VI. Should the attempt be made to refute millenarianism in a fair and candid manner, very many persons would ascertain what the doctrine is which is so offensive, and might be led to embrace it.

It is very evident that only a few persons have a correct knowledge of the distinctive peculiarities of those who are denominated millenarians. They may have seen their views caricatured; the inferences which their opponents have drawn



from it put for their views themselves. They may also have seen false statements respecting the principles of interpretation which are adopted by millenarians. In a fair discussion, in which a knowledge of the truth is the object to be attained, the points in dispute would be presented together with the Scriptures which relate to them, and the manner of interpreting them adopted by either party would be known to all. Under such circumstances many persons might be fascinated with the belief that Christ will certainly come, and will put an end to the reign of sin and Satan, and will raise up his faithful ones to sit with him in his kingdom, and participate in the glories of that period which they longed for and prayed might come while they were in the flesh. Furthermore, they might discover that millenarians do not seek to pervert Scripture, that they have no new modes of interpretation, but that they follow the same laws of language which the orthodox adopt in defending the doctrines of grace; whereas their opponents use the same lawlessness which is practised by the defenders of the most rank heresies. Many might discover that they were and ever had been millenarians since they became Christians, and that the reason they supposed they were not is, that they have mistaken the false representations of millenarianism for the doctrine itself.

It would be difficult to foresee what the final end would be if any considerable portion of the church should become millenarian. The churches have been exhorted to support benevolent operations in order that, by the gradual working of causes now existing, the millennium may be ushered in. It has been implied, if not directly taught, that all that is wanted to convert the world is money—the requisite funds. Should the churches abandon the present notion that the world is rapidly improving in divine knowledge and piety through the operation of associations and measures which characterize the present day, and become convinced that practical infidelity and worldliness are becoming more and more prevalent; should they be convinced that a darker day is coming, so that faith will hardly be found on the earth; it is feared that they would lose their courage, and would have neither the resolution nor the disposition to do anything to cause the gospel to be preached to all nations,

according to the commandment of Christ. Indeed, it has been predicted that the general prevalence of the doctrine of the personal reign of Christ with his saints would produce this disastrous result. And perhaps it might. It is true that the first Christians were not affected in this manner through a belief of it. In no period in the history of the church have the disciples of Christ been so active and untiring in their efforts to cause the gospel to be preached everywhere, among all nations, as in the first age, when millenarianism was generally received as an essential element of the Christian faith. Then missionaries went among the heathen, whether supported by the churches at home or not. Ministers of the gospel could preach with or without pecuniary support; and the brotherhood gave freely of their substance to meet the necessities of the church, and no man counted what he possessed as his own, and converts multiplied while enemies raged and persecuted even unto death.

But then the early Christians were not such men as those who are members of the churches in these days. They were a simple and childlike race. Why? They received the words of Christ and of his inspired apostles with all the simplicity of little children. They were persuaded that when God spoke he was to be believed; and it was enough for them to know what the will of the Lord was; and it was not necessary to reconcile what he said with their reason and philosophy before they would be influenced by it. And since they knew that Christ had commanded his disciples to go into all the world and preach the gospel unto every creature, the belief that a dark day would come, that the man of sin would arise and prevail for an indefinite time, did not check their ardor. They had no difficulties, no perplexities, for they trusted in Christ; that he would order all things so that he himself would be glorified. But now men have become refined, intelligent, philosophical, and poetical. They must know the reasons, the whys and the wherefores, before they will receive and submit to the commandments of God. They will not admit that his words are true until they can verify them by their own reason, nor yield to his requirements until they can discover their reasonableness. And they are so practical that they will not do anything until they think they can see what use the Lord will make of their labors.

Perhaps a belief in millenarianism would suppress the efforts of such intelligent, philosophical, refined, and poetical Christians. How disastrous, then, might be the consequence if it should spread further among the churches! Since discussion would have a tendency to lead others to embrace the dangerous doctrine, it would be prudent to avoid it. And as millenarians, though few in number, are making some stir in the world, and some check must be put to their influence, and some answer must be given to those who inquire about them and their doctrine, they must be dealt wisely with.

Undoubtedly the most prudent and the most efficient method of hindering the diffusion of a knowledge of the doctrine is to publish occasionally a distorted view of it in some quarterly. It will be particularly important to conceal the prominent facts which it comprises. In doing this it will be necessary to make much of supposed difficulties which it involves,—of differences of opinion among millenarians respecting some unimportant topics not connected with the doctrine which all receive. Furthermore, it will be particularly important to give an unwarrantable meaning to certain characteristic names or terms by which millenarians or their views have been designated. Since they are called literalists, it will be convenient to insinuate that they think there are no figures of speech, no metaphors, comparisons, or symbols in the sacred writings. And as they do not think that Christ has said he will bring all men to a knowledge of the truth until he shall come, it will prejudice many against them if it be reported that they believe that Christianity is a failure. And as they think that the millennium will not begin until Christ shall take to himself his great power, and come and reign, and shall, by an act of power, remove Satan from the position which he now occupies as the deceiver of the nations, it will make the doctrine odious to represent that it teaches that men, during the millennium, will be converted by an exhibition of the power of God, and not by the word of truth and the Holy Spirit. And when the millenarians declare that they believe no such things, and call upon their opponents to show where they have ever taught them or expressed their belief of them, it will be necessary to keep dark, to say nothing, to make no replies, just as if millenarians were not worthy of notice. And when

inquired of in private whether these monstrous notions have been really put forth by any persons, an answer which will generally be satisfactory may be made, by saying they are to be inferred from the doctrine as advocated and avowed.

The Christian public may also be much prejudiced against millenarianism by suggesting, as occasion shall admit, that its advocates have some peculiarity about them,—either that they are very ardent and fond of new things, or that they are conservative, and look upon all improvements and changes with no favorable eye. That they are visionary, and consequently pleased with extravagant notions; or that they are matter-of-fact men—scholars—and consequently wish to give everything a tangible form. And as every man has something personal which makes him unlike all other men, it will not be difficult, as occasion requires, to find something peculiar to which a tendency to millenarianism may be ascribed. By methods like these the points in dispute may be kept out of sight, and no stir will be made among the people, and existing prejudices may be encouraged and strengthened, while, at the same time, there will not be the least suspicion among the masses that there is wanting courage to meet the question openly and fairly.

---

ART. V.—THE TWO RECORDS; THE MOSAIC AND THE GEOLOGICAL. A Lecture delivered before the Young Men's Christian Association in Exeter Hall, London, by Hugh Miller, author of "The Old Red Sandstone," &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

BY THE EDITOR.

GEOLOGISTS have urged it with much zeal and confidence as a reason that their theory of the great age of the world should be received as authoritative, that their discoveries and speculations in respect to the structure of the globe have risen to the rank of a demonstrative science, and are entitled to be received with as implicit faith, as the facts and conclusions are, that are established in astronomy, mecha-

nics, or any other branch of exact knowledge. This, as we showed on a former occasion, is a very extraordinary mistake for men advancing such a claim,—inasmuch as the ground on which they found their inference of the age of the world, instead of the facts of geology, as they maintain,—is but a mere hypothesis respecting the mode in which those facts were brought into existence. Their fancied age of the earth, accordingly, in place of being a logical deduction from an ascertained premise, is a mere conclusion from an undemonstrated and undemonstrable assumption, and has no more title to the rank of a scientific truth, than any other inference from a wholly gratuitous and unauthorized postulate.

We have an exemplification of the want of anything like scientific demonstration in their speculations on that subject, in Mr. Hugh Miller's lecture lately delivered before the Young Men's Christian Association, London—a specimen of ill-judged pretensions and crude declamation such as might be expected from one, who openly proclaims that he makes his geological theory the standard by which he judges of the meaning of the history given in Genesis of the creation; and instead of conforming his speculations to that history, endeavors to bend the word of God into harmony with his speculations.

It is felt and admitted by geologists of all classes, that their doctrine of the great age of the world is at variance with the plain meaning of the narrative of the creation in Genesis. Dean Conybeare, Dr. Buckland, Professor Sedgwick, Dr. J. P. Smith, and a crowd of others in Great Britain, and Dr. Hitchcock and others in this country, have attempted to remove that contradiction by the assumption that a vast period intervened between the primeval creation of the heavens and earth, announced in the first verse of Genesis i., and the work of the six days' creation, the narrative of which they hold is commenced in the second verse; and that it was during that supposed immense and indeterminable period, that the present geological strata were formed, and the vegetables and animals lived which are entombed in them,—to account for the existence and fossilization of which it is, that they resort to their theory of a vast age of the world,—and they maintain that that assump-

tion furnishes a solution of all the phenomena of the strata so perfect, as to entitle it to be regarded as scientifically demonstrated. Of the wholly unphilosophical character of that assumption, of the gross violation of the word of God, which such an interpolation of infinite ages and infinite creations of which the sacred narrative makes no mention, involves, and of the impossibility of accounting, in consistency with the laws of the physical world, for the reduction of the earth to the chaos in which it existed at the epoch to which the second verse of the Mosaic history refers, and for the extinction of the sun, moon, and stars,—difficulties infinitely greater than those which they employ their theory to evade,—they take no notice whatever. They seem to imagine that the interpolation of an illimitable period at that point in the world's history, is all that is necessary to yield the explication which they desire. How the heavenly luminaries could be divested, as they hold that they were, of their light, or how the continents and islands of the first earth, with all their lofty mountains, could be reduced to a level, and buried beneath the ocean, they do not pause to inquire. Mr. Miller says of that theory, as it was propounded by Dr. Chalmers :

“ It teaches and teaches truly that between the first act of creation, which evoked out of the previous nothing, the *matter* of the heavens and earth, and the first act of the first day's work recorded in *Genesis*, periods of vast duration may have intervened ; but further, it insists that the days themselves were but natural days of twenty-four hours each ; and that, ere they began, the earth, though, mayhap, in the previous period a fair residence of life, had become void and formless, and the sun, moon, and stars, though mayhap they had before given light, had been, at least in relation to our planet, temporarily extinguished. In short, while it teaches that the successive creations of the geologist may all have found ample room in the period preceding that creation to which man belongs, it teaches also that the record in *Genesis* bears reference to but the existing creation, and that there lay between it and the preceding ones a chaotic period of death and darkness.”—Pp. 6, 7.

That scheme, however, which in 1814, he says, was “ perfectly adequate to bring the Mosaic narrative into harmony with what was known at the time of geologic history,” he

holds has been confuted by subsequent discoveries. So far from the earth's having been in a chaotic state immediately before the creation of the present races of plants and animals, it is ascertained that many species of each are the same as those that lie fossilized in the strata, and that their existence is traceable back, therefore, to the time of the formation of the strata, and thence,—if they date back innumerable and undeterminable ages, as geologists affirm, and the history in Genesis is a history of their creation,—then their creation must have taken place innumerable ages earlier than the Mosaic epoch, as it is ordinarily reckoned. Geology, accordingly, instead of having been brought by its recent advances into any nearer consistency with the narrative in Genesis, has become more flagrantly at war with it. It admits that the creation of the plants and animals recorded in that history, must have been the creation of the plants and animals that are buried in the strata, and that now live on the earth; while, at the same time, it maintains that they cannot have been created in the space of six natural days, but that the first in their series must have been called into being innumerable ages ago, and that new orders were created at subsequent epochs separated from each other by vast intervals. He says:

“It is a great fact, now fully established in the course of geological discovery, that between the plants which, in the present time, cover the earth, and the animals which inhabit, and the animals and plants of the later extinct creations, *there occurred no break or blank*, but that, on the contrary, *many of the existing organisms were contemporary* during the morning of their being, with many of the extinct ones during the evening of theirs. We know further that not a few of the shells which now live on our coasts, and several even of the wild animals which continue to survive amid our tracts of hill and forest, *were in existence many ages ere the human age began*. Instead of dating their beginning only *a single natural day, or at most two natural days, in advance of man*, they must have preceded him by *many thousand years*. In fine, in consequence of that comparatively recent extension of geologic fact in the direction of the later systems and formations, through which we are led to know that the present creation was not cut off abruptly from the preceding one, but that, on the contrary, it dovetailed into it at a thousand different points, we are led also to know, *that any scheme*

*of reconciliation which would separate between the recent and the extinct existences by a chaotic gulf of death and darkness, is a scheme which no longer meets the necessities of the case. Though perfectly adequate forty years ago, it has been greatly outgrown by the progress of geological discovery, and is, as I have said, adequate no longer; and it becomes a not unimportant matter to determine the special scheme that would bring into completest harmony the course of creation as now ascertained by the geologist, and that brief but sublime narrative of its progress which forms a meet introduction in Holy Writ, to the history of the human family."*—Pp. 11–13.

The light manner in which he speaks of the confutation of this theory, on which the vindication of the word of God from an assumed contradiction to the facts of the natural world was rested by a long line of writers for half a century, does not indicate that he has a very high estimate of the sanctity of the divine word. He seems to think it was an adequate exculpation of Genesis from the dishonor of a false statement, as long as no discoveries were made that revealed its untenableness. It was good ground enough to support the faith of the church in the veracity of God, till Mr. M. and two of his fellow-countrymen came on the stage, and extending their inquiries into the older and later strata, made discoveries that show that no "chaos of death and darkness" can have intervened between the life of the fossilized plants and animals, and those that now subsist on the earth. That the word of God has been deeply disgraced by resting its vindication from the charge of the grossest error on such a shallow and presumptuous hypothesis; and that the hopeless confutation of that hypothesis indicates that the theory of the age of the world which it was invented to sustain, is as false as itself is, he seems not to have the slightest suspicion. That the Bible is made the jeer and mockery of infidels; and that thousands of those who have been religiously educated are filled with doubt and disgust by the eager folly with which its ministers grasp at such worthless straws for the support of their faith, and parade them with all the pomp of the most indubitable and momentous certainties in vindication of the veracity of the sacred word, does not disturb Mr. Miller's complacency in his theory in



the least, nor check the unmeasured assurance, the fanatical enthusiasm, with which he rests in the infallible truth of his speculations on the age of the world.

As the facts of geology are held to be thus at war with that hypothesis, which was long regarded by the leading writers on the subject, and still is by a considerable share of geologists and theologians, as the only legitimate means of reconciling the theory of the great age of the world with the Mosaic narrative, "what is the scheme of reconciliation which" Mr. M. ventures "to propound?" After enumerating some appearances which he supposes indicate a greater age of the earth than is ascribed to it by the history of its creation in Genesis, he says :

"Such are a few of the geological facts which lead me to believe that the *days* of the Mosaic account were *great periods*, not *natural days* ; and be it remembered that between the scheme of lengthened periods and the scheme of a merely local chaos, which existed no one knows how, and of a merely local creation which had its scene no one knows where, geological science leaves us now no choice whatever. It has been urged, however, that this scheme of periods is irreconcilable with that divine 'reason' for the institution of the Sabbath, which he who appointed the day of old has in his goodness vouchsafed to man. *I have failed to see any force in the objection.* God the Creator, who wrought during six periods, rested during the seventh period ; and as we have no evidence whatever that he recommenced his work of creation—as on the contrary man seems to be the last formed of creatures—God may be resting still. The presumption is strong that his Sabbath is an extended period, not a natural day, and that the work of redemption is his Sabbath day's work. And so I cannot see that it in the least interferes with the integrity of the reason rendered to read it as follows : Work during six periods, and rest on the seventh ; for in six periods the Lord created the heavens and the earth, and on the seventh *he* rested. The divine periods may have been very great, the human periods very small ; just as a vast continent or the huge earth itself is very great, and a map or geological globe very small ; but if, in the map or globe, the proportions be faithfully maintained, and the scale, though a minute one, be true in all its parts and applications, we pronounce the map or globe, notwithstanding the smallness of its size, a faithful copy. Were man's Sabbaths to be kept as enjoined, and in the divine proportions, it would scarcely interfere with the

logic of the reason annexed to the fourth commandment, though in this matter, as in all others in which man can be an imitator of God, the imitation should be a miniature one.”—Pp. 41–43.

This piece of very unscientific declamation is worthy of one who, having gained a moderate amount of geological knowledge,—for he is very far, we believe, from being a master of the subject,—feels himself authorized to set aside the word of God, or force on it a false and unnatural meaning, because it contradicts the hypothesis on which he attempts to account for the present condition of the globe.

1. He introduces it by a sort of mock-modest protestation that he does not affect to decide on the import of the history in Genesis i., on the ground of philology :

“Let me remark that I come before you not as a philologist, but simply as a student of geological fact, who, believing his Bible, believes also, that though theologians have at various times striven hard to pledge it to false science, geographical, astronomical, and geological, it has been pledged by its divine author to no falsehood whatever.” “Premising, then, that I make no pretensions to even the slightest skill in philology, I remark that it has been held by accomplished philologists that the days of the Mosaic creation may be regarded, without doing violence to the genius of the Hebrew language, as successive periods of great extent. And certainly, in looking at my English Bible, I find that the portion of time spoken of in the first chapter of Genesis as *six* days, is spoken of in the second chapter as *one* day. True there are other philologers, such as the late Professor Moses Stuart, who take a different view ; but then I find this same Professor Stuart striving hard to make the phraseology of Moses ‘fix the antiquity of the globe;’ and so *as a mere geologist, I reject his philology*, on exactly the same principle on which the mere geographer would reject, and be justified in rejecting, the philology of the doctors of Salamanca, or on which the mere astronomer would reject, and be justified in rejecting, the philology of Turretin and the old Franciscans. *I would, in any such case, at once and without hesitation, cut the philological knot, by determining that that philology cannot be sound, which would commit the Scriptures to a science that cannot be true.*”—Pp. 24–26.

We doubt not this disclaimer of skill in philology was uttered in truth and sincerity ; and it is unfortunate that he seems not to have fully understood its import, for it turns

out, after all, that it is, in fact, on *philology* that he founds his construction of the Mosaic record by which he attempts to bring it into harmony with his theory; or in other words, it is on the sense of the term *day*, and a false and arbitrary sense, that he builds it; which shows that his want of knowledge on the subject is indeed real, and as extensive as his protestation represents. He states a few of what he calls geological facts, which, he says, lead him "to believe that the *days* of the Mosaic account were *great periods*, not natural days;" and he offers as his justification in assigning them that sense, that "in looking at" his "English Bible," he finds "that the portion of time spoken of in the first chapter of Genesis as *six days*, is spoken of in the second as *one day*." Take away, therefore, this philological reason, and the whole foundation vanishes on which he builds his attempt to bring the history in Genesis into consistency with his theory that the days of the creation, instead of natural days, were immensely long periods. But he is as mistaken in his assertion that the "*six days*" of the first chapter of Genesis are "spoken of in the second chapter as *one day*," as he is in the fancy that he does not find his construction of Moses on philology. The six days of the creation are not declared in Genesis ii. 4, to be "*one day*." The word *day*, in this latter passage, is not used in the sense of a period of twenty-four hours, or the revolution of the globe on its axis, but in the sense of *time*, which is a common meaning of the term, when used by synecdoche for the period of an act or event that occupied *less* or *more* than a day; as when it is said of the time of a disaster, "it was an unfortunate day," though the disaster itself occupied perhaps but a moment, and took place when the day had nearly passed; and when a time of prosperity is called a prosperous day, though the period characterized by the prosperity is longer than a single, and perhaps than several natural days. But the time denoted by the word in this instance is formally defined to be that which was occupied in the creation of the heavens and the earth, and the plants and beasts of the field. At the most, therefore, even if it is held to extend down to the creation of man, of which there may be doubt, ii. 5-7, it includes only six days, which are expressly defined to be natural days, consisting of evening and morning—not "*great periods*," as Mr. Miller asserts. It truly

reflects but little credit on his somewhat-ostentatious pretensions to a scientific treatment of the subject, that he betrays so sad a misapprehension of the ground on which he proceeds.

2. He exemplifies his disposition at once, and without hesitation, to cut the knot of philology, by determining that "that philology cannot be sound which would commit the Scriptures" to a view of the creation of the world that differs from his, in confidently representing, as he does, that "the six days of the Mosaic narrative" were "not natural days, but lengthened periods." Each of the six days of the creation is expressly defined in the text as the time of one revolution of the earth on its axis, consisting of evening and morning, or one period of darkness, which God called night, and one period of light, which he named day—*v. 5*. No definition could more clearly determine the period as the time occupied by a single revolution of the earth on its axis. There is no evening nor morning, but the evening and morning of such a revolution. There is no night, nor any corresponding period of light, but the night and the day of such a revolution. Mr. Miller, therefore, in assuming and asserting that those six days were not natural days, but were "great periods," not only disregards the laws of philology, but he boldly sets aside the formal and unequivocal definition which God has given of those days as ordinary days of the earth's revolution on its axis. No more undisguised or inexcusable violation of the sacred word was ever perpetrated. What a consummate mockery of the truth and authority of the Bible is the pretence that it is to be reconciled with Mr. Miller's ignorant and fanatical speculations, and saved from the disgrace of a hopeless confutation, by such a shallow and audacious expedient! Mr. Miller obviously has not the slightest idea that the laws of philology are absolutely obligatory in the interpretation of all those parts of the Bible, the meaning of which, instead of symbols, is conveyed exclusively through language; that, as their whole meaning lies in the language, there is no other method of determining what it is but by interpreting it by the laws of language; and therefore that if there were anything expressed by that language thus interpreted, that is false, it would be a proof that it is not inspired; not that it is not properly interpreted. He supposes that no matter what the language of the sacred

text is, or the laws of philology by which it is to be interpreted, still if that which it expresses, interpreted according to those laws, is false, the passage in which it occurs is nevertheless to be held as the word of God, and infallibly true, and another sense, though wholly ungrammatical and foreign, forced on it that will bring it into harmony with his geological science! What a lesson to be infused into the minds of the Young Men's Christian Association of London, under the pretext of saving the word of God from confutation by geology! Can an individual who heard the address, or who reads it, fail to see that if the liberty which Mr. M. takes with the history of the creation in Genesis is legitimate, the philological sense of the word of God is not of the least authority; that instead of its being a specific and unequivocal revelation, that is to be received as it is, as expressing the identical truth which God employed it to convey, the whole meaning of the language is subject to modification according to the *à priori* assumptions, or the arbitrary and mistaken speculations of those who interpret it? If he may set aside the plain and indubitable grammatical sense of a passage because it does not accord with his geology, the astronomer, the physiologist, the archæologist, the rationalistic metaphysician, may set aside the sense of any other passage or passages, because they do not accord with the theories they entertain of their favorite branches of knowledge. Mr. Miller's persuasion that geology has become a science, and that its conclusions are authoritative, is no more a justification of his course, than the like persuasion of rationalists and atheists is of theirs. Kant regarded himself as having reduced the philosophy of the mind to an exact science, and believed that he had demonstrated by the most unanswerable proof that we neither have, nor can have, any knowledge or evidence of the existence of God, or of the universe; and that is the doctrine of the whole train of his followers. They may claim, therefore, on the ground of their metaphysical science, that the whole body of the Scriptures, the external universe, and God himself, are mere unrealities, the sheer phantasma of the understanding, without any authority over our consciences, or any claim to our faith, as legitimately as Mr. Miller can claim on the ground of his geological science that the grammatical sense of the

sacred text should be set aside, and a foreign and false meaning intruded in its place.

3. If, as he assumes and asserts, the six days of the creation, and the seventh day on which God rested, instead of being natural days, were great periods, it is then certain either that man has not yet had any working day whatever, or else that he has not had any Sabbath, inasmuch as no period of the vast length which he ascribes to each of those days, has yet passed, since the seventh commenced. It is indisputable that the six days of the creation, and the first Sabbath, were of identically the length of the six days which God appointed to man as working days, and the Sabbath which he appointed to him as a day of rest. That is clear from the language: "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made, and God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Here certainly is nothing to indicate that the seventh day denotes any other period than that which was occupied by each of the preceding six days. To assume that it stands for an immeasurably long period, is to offer the grossest violence to the language. Mr. Miller, indeed, admits and claims that they all alike denote very long periods. That the seventh day denotes the same period as the sixth, the fifth, the fourth, and each of the others, is certain, also, from Exodus xx., in which in the fourth commandment the reason of its consecration is again given: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it." Here most clearly the seventh day was of the same length as each of the six. There is no hint that it was not. It bears the same name, and it was treated by God in his whole administration over the Hebrews as of the same length, and was so regarded by them. If then, as Mr. Miller assumes and affirms, they

were all alike great periods—many thousands, and perhaps myriads of myriads of years—not natural days, it follows indisputably, that either man has had no working days yet, or else he has had no Sabbath. If the Sabbath which God consecrated for man began on the natural day that immediately followed the close of the work of creation, then plainly he has had no working day, for no such prolonged period as Mr. Miller asserts the time signifies, has yet passed since he was called into existence. He claims, indeed, that the Sabbath on which God rested—which was demonstrably identically the same as that which he consecrated as the first Sabbath to man—is co-extensive with the work of redemption, which, so far from having reached its end, is to continue for ever. On Mr. M.'s construction, therefore, it is clear that man is never to have a working day, or if he does, it is not to come till the work of redemption is closed! How beautifully this tallies with the fourth commandment, and with the construction God himself put on it in the sense with which he used the days of the creation, and on the Sabbath day itself, in his administration over the Hebrews! If, on the other hand, it is held that the first six days during which man is to work, precede the seventh on which he is to rest, then it follows with equal certainty that man has not yet had any Sabbath. It follows, moreover, that God's day of rest is a wholly different period from man's day of rest, for Mr. M. holds that God's Sabbath is now in progress, and is to continue contemporaneously with the work of redemption. In either case, Mr. M.'s theory completely annihilates the fourth commandment as a law having an adaptation to man's condition, and authority over him! What a beautiful issue of so pompous a pretence of reconciling the sacred word with geology, in such a manner as to save its credit as an inspired record of the work of God! In what a flattering light it presents Mr. Miller's perspicacity as a scientific inquirer! With what graceful modesty it invests his protestations that he knows nothing of philology! Under what admirable discipline he must keep that virtue, to circumscribe its influence within the sphere of that department of knowledge! Had he allowed it to extend its sway into the domain either of religion or geology, is it credible that he would have ventured on the daring and inexcusable assault

on the divine legislation, of which he is here guilty? We think not. Nothing but the most pitifully false estimate of himself; nothing but the most bewildering hallucination in respect to what he calls the science of geology, could have led him to assume so presumptuous an attitude towards God.

4. His assumption that God's six days of creation, and seventh day of rest, were of a wholly different length from the six days of labor and seventh of rest that are assigned to man, is not only wholly arbitrary, but against the unequivocal teaching of the history. The six days of the creation are expressly defined as periods of the earth's revolution on its axis, comprising an evening or night, and a morning or day. "God divided the light from the darkness," the sacred writer relates—by causing the earth to revolve—"and God called the light day, and the darkness he called night; and"—the two together he then affirms—"the evening and the morning were the first day." A more point blank contradiction to the sacred text, therefore, cannot be devised, than is offered by Mr. M., in assuming that God's six days of creation, and seventh of rest, are of a different length, and immeasurably so, from the seven days of man's labor and rest. On what ground can he attempt to justify it? He disclaims any reference to philology to sustain it—which is the only source from which a legitimate reason for it could possibly be drawn; for if the *language* does not authorize it, as that is the only instrument employed in the passage to express the fact which God meant to state, it can have no authority whatever. Mr. Miller's assumption, accordingly, that the sense of God's six days of creation, and seventh day of rest, is that which he ascribes to them of indefinitely long periods, in contradistinction from natural days, is nothing less than a bold and unblushing assertion that the facts are directly the converse of what God represents them to have been! An issue worthy of a writer, who fancies that by virtue of a little smattering in geology he can settle the meaning of the sacred record independently of any consideration of the *language* in which it is expressed! Such is his method of bringing the inspired history into harmony with his theory! He openly and formally sets the sacred text aside. He proclaims with a mock affectation of humility, that he does not pay any attention



to the language, which is the sole vehicle of its meaning ; and he ends by declaring that the facts were what his theory demands, and not what the Spirit of inspiration has recorded ! This in a Paine, a Voltaire, a Baur, a Strauss, a Parker, and a Newman, is regarded as infidelity. In Mr. Hugh Miller, and others of his school, it is called scientific Christianity !

5. He makes an equally unfortunate display of his critical powers, in his supposition that "the human periods," as he calls them, must have been "small," compared to "the divine periods," in proportion to the nothingness of man's nature to the infinitude of God's. "Were man's Sabbaths to be kept as enjoined, and in the divine proportions, it would scarcely interfere with the logic of the reason annexed to the fourth commandment, though in this matter, as in all others in which man can be an imitator of God, the imitation should be a miniature one." What proportion, then, according to this notion, must man's Sabbath bear to God's ! Not the length of a moment ! God's Sabbath, Mr. M. expressly teaches, is the period of the work of redemption. But that work, the Bible assures us, is to continue for ever. Christ, as "he is to continue for ever, has an unchangeable priesthood, whence he is for ever able to save them that come unto God through him, always living to make intercession for them." As he is always to live to intercede for men who are for ever to come unto God through him, the work of redemption is to continue for ever. God's Sabbath, therefore, according to Mr. M., is to be eternal. What ratio, then, can man's Sabbath bear to it ? Not that of an instant to myriads of ages ! The whole of man's life, indeed, bears no appreciable proportion to an eternal duration. Mr. Miller's scheme, thus, in fact gives man no Sabbath whatever. He strikes it as effectually from his hands by this supposition, as by his assumption that God's days of creation and rest were immeasurable periods, which implies either that man has thus far had no Sabbath, or else that he has had no working days.

6. He is equally unfortunate in his representation "that the work of redemption" is God's "Sabbath day's work." As God's Sabbath began on the close of the sixth day, and the work of redemption did not begin till after man fell, it

implies that man never spent a Sabbath nor a day in innocence, but fell the day he was created, and within an hour or two probably after Eve's creation; as her creation took place at least some time after his. But it is certain from the sacred narrative that they did not fall on the sixth day; as it is recorded, that immediately after the close of the sixth day's work, "God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good;" and it is added, "And the evening and the morning were the sixth day." This implies most clearly that man continued at the close of the sixth day in the state of innocence in which he was created. The description of God's resting on the seventh also indicates that no fall of man had taken place at that time. "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day, God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Here certainly are no traces of a fall. The whole representation shows that man, as well as the whole of God's works, continued in the integrity in which they were created, and were contemplated by him with complacency as good. According to Mr. Miller, however, the fall must have already taken place, and man been sentenced to toil, sorrow, and death, and banished probably from paradise; or else the work of redemption must have begun before there were any offenders to redeem!—a blunder which it were discreditable for an intelligent Sunday scholar to make. Mr. M., however, seems to consider himself at liberty to make any assumption, no matter how groundless or contradictory to the truth it may be, that will serve to bring the sacred text into a seeming harmony with his theory.

7. There is no such parallel as he represents between the relations of his geological theory to the history of the creation in Genesis, and the relations to the language of the Scriptures of Galileo's doctrine that the sun is the centre of the solar system, and that the earth moves round it; or the doctrine of Columbus that the earth is a globe instead of an extended plain. Galileo saw from the perpetual movement of the planets at which he looked through his telescope, from

the line of his sight, and the necessity of continually changing the direction of his telescope in order to keep them in the sphere of his vision, that either they, or else the earth, or both, were in continual motion, and that their motion was in the same direction relatively to the sun; i. e. in an orbit round that luminary. He saw that fact also from their continual change of position relatively to each other, being sometimes in conjunction, sometimes in opposition; and at different stages of their movements in all the different positions relatively to each other and the sun which they would occupy if they revolved round that body. He saw also, with the most perfect distinctness, that the satellites of Jupiter revolve around that planet, and that the moon revolves round the earth. He saw, also, that Venus and Mars vary at times in their apparent diameters; and these are facts that cannot be accounted for on any supposition except that the sun is the centre of the planetary system, and that the earth and other planets move round it. They are direct proofs, therefore, that they have that motion. But Mr. Hugh Miller cannot allege a solitary geological fact that forms any such proof of the truth of his theory of the age of the earth; or that does not admit of as natural an explanation on the supposition that the earth was created at the Mosaic epoch, about six thousand years ago, as on the supposition that it was called into being at any earlier period. In like manner Columbus saw that the moon, the planets, and the sun, are globes, from their circular shape. He saw from the eclipse of the moon that the earth is a globe also, inasmuch as it casts a circular shadow. He saw likewise on sailing into the Atlantic, and even into the broader parts of the Mediterranean, that the surface of the earth is everywhere circular, from the fact that distant objects, as ships, lofty islands, or mountain shores, were at first visible only at top, because the ocean rose in an arch between him and them, but were seen more and more in their height as that arch was diminished by his approach to them. These facts were positive proofs of the rotundity of the earth, and admit of solution on no other supposition. Mr. Miller, however, cannot cite a solitary fact of geology that forms any such positive proof of the truth of his theory of the age of the earth. They are all as easily solved on the supposition that the Mosaic history of the creation gives its

true date, as that it was called into existence at the epoch, Mr. Miller would assign to its creation.

It was a sheer mistake that the doctors at Salamanca and Rome imagined that the doctrines of Columbus and Galileo are at war with the Scriptures. They are in perfect harmony with them; as the language of the inspired word, which it was supposed they contradicted, presents the phenomena of the natural world according as they appear to the senses; and as those appearances, as such, are facts, the representation of them as facts is perfectly accurate and true: while as the shapes and movements of the bodies of the solar system, affirmed by Columbus and Galileo, are the grounds and causes of those appearances, they also are facts, and are perfectly consistent with, and necessary conditions, indeed, of the reality and truth of those other facts of appearance. That the sun has the appearance of rising and setting, for example, is the consequence of the revolution of the earth on its own axis, and is perfectly consistent with it. The whole difficulty of the Catholic doctors, therefore, arose from their not seeing the consistency and necessary connexion of the two classes of facts.

But it is not by a mistake that Mr. Miller's theory of the creation and age of the world is supposed to be in contradiction to the Mosaic record of its creation. He admits that they are at variance with each other. His whole attempt at harmonizing them proceeds on the fact that they are point-blank opposites. He does not pretend that the history of the seven days of Genesis is a history of mere appearances to the senses, while the facts that were the grounds of those appearances were of a wholly different nature. Instead, he undertakes to bring them into harmony by openly setting aside the views given in the sacred narrative of the facts, and assuming and affirming that the facts were of altogether a different nature! His reconciliation of what he claims are the real facts of the creation with his theory, is, therefore, by impeaching the truth of the inspired record, or else wholly setting it aside: not by showing that they are literally and truly consistent with each other. Should Mr. Miller carry his investigations in astronomy and geography far enough to comprehend what the relation of the apparent facts stated in the Scriptures is to the astronomical and geo-

graphical facts for which Columbus and Galileo contended, and in which the other class have their origin, he would never venture again to represent the relation of his theory to the Scriptures as presenting any parallel to theirs.

8. The geological facts which Mr. Miller alleges as indicating that the age of the earth is far greater than that assigned to it by the Mosaic record are no proofs whatever of that greater age. They are simply that the coast line of Great Britain was once further inland than it now is; that great excavations have been made in the rocks by the action of the waves of the sea; that the climate was once much warmer than it is now; and that its races of animals were very different from those that at present inhabit it. But none of these facts demonstrate that more than six thousand years have passed since the creation. Mr. M. does not, in fact, directly build on them his inference of the age of the world. He tacitly assumes that the agencies by which the changes which have taken place were produced were of the same kind and acted with the same degree of energy as those by which similar effects are wrought at the present time, and founds his theory on that postulate. Take that away, and his inference of the vast age of the earth is left without any ground for its support. For if the changes to which he refers were wrought by agencies of far greater power and that acted on a far greater scale than agencies of the same classes are now acting, it is apparent that those changes may have been wrought in a proportionably shorter period. Let it be supposed, for example, that the rocks to which he refers were, at the time of their elevation to their present position, so soft as to be easily worn by the dash of the sea, as rocks now often are at a considerable distance below the surface, and but a few years, or months even, might have been required to accomplish the excavations that have been wrought in them. And let it be supposed that the island of Great Britain was at once upheaved from the sea, so as to give its ancient coast line its present elevation, and the recession of the sea and the changes following it, in place of requiring ages, may have been accomplished in a few days or hours.

Mr. Miller's theory of the age of the world is not in reality, therefore, founded on the facts of geology, which he

alleges as demonstrating it, but instead, on a mistaken and most ungeological hypothesis respecting the energy and scale of the causes by which they were produced. Had he pushed his investigations into the subject far enough to discover this fact, which is graven in the most conspicuous and unequivocal characters on the front of the whole of his speculations in respect to the age of the world, he would have seen that the pretext of demonstrating, by his geological facts, that the world is immensely older than the history in Genesis represents, is a mere sham, and that his own and the reasoning and declamation of others respecting it are utterly unworthy of the name of a science.

Such is his attempt to force what he calls "the two records, the Mosaic and the geological," into harmony with each other. Instead of bringing the inspired narrative of the creation into a concurrence with his theory, he has done nothing except to show that in truth, however unconscious he may be of the real import of his procedure, he does not deem the testimony of the sacred word on the subject of any consideration whatever; first, by proclaiming that he regards the conclusions he has reached in his speculations on the age of the world, as infallibly certain, and holds that it is by a false construction that any declarations of the narrative in Genesis or other parts of the Bible seem to contradict those conclusions. Next, by proclaiming that the question what the true meaning of those declarations is, is not, by him at least, to be determined by philology, that is by the language in which they are expressed, construed by its proper laws, but by what he calls the facts and conclusions of geology, and such a sense ascribed to them as brings them into concurrence with his speculative system. Thirdly, by proclaiming that the real facts of the creation of the earth were not what the inspired narrative in Genesis represents them to have been; and assertion in direct contradiction to the definitions given in the text itself, and the established and only meaning of the terms, that the six days of the creation were "long periods," instead of "natural days," and the Sabbath an eternal duration, in place of the space of the earth's revolution on its axis. His fancied vindication of his geological theory is, in fact, therefore, nothing more nor less than an admission that it is in direct

contravention of the inspired narrative of the creation ; a bold assertion that the facts of the creation are what his theory assumes, not what God has declared them to be ; and a violent and lawless ascription to the language of the sacred history of a sense that, instead of belonging to it, involves it in the most palpable and fatal contradiction. The effect of his address, accordingly, on all who have intelligence enough to comprehend its import, must be to depreciate the sacred Scriptures, to excite the impression that they are confuted by natural science, and consequently that they cannot be the work of inspiration, but are either the fabrication of artful, or the dream of weak and deluded men, and unworthy, therefore, of reliance or respect. What other impressions can be left on the minds, especially of the young who have no established religious principles, by such shallow and self-confuting attempts to save the Bible from the discredit of a contradiction by science ? The whole class of professed Christian geologists, to which Mr. Miller belongs, proclaim with the most unhesitating assurance, that geology has become a demonstrative science ; that the conclusion which it advances respecting the vast age of the world, possesses all the certainty that belongs to the most unquestionable facts and conclusions of astronomy or mechanics ; and that to admit, therefore, that that conclusion is contradicted by the history of the creation in Genesis, were to admit and declare that that history is not true, and thence that the Pentateuch, of which it is a part, and the whole sacred volume indeed, which recognises that history as authentic, is not the word of God. The minds of the readers and hearers of their discussions are thus filled with a vivid impression, that if their representations are just, the question whether the Bible is true, and entitled to be received as the word of God or not—depends on the question whether it can be legitimately and naturally reconciled with the doctrine of geology respecting the age of the world. With this feeling raised to great strength, they turn to the expedients by which these geologists affect to reconcile the sacred history with their theory, and instead of finding them legitimate and satisfactory, discover that they are mere arbitrary assumptions ; and, in fact, nothing less than virtual admissions that the sacred record is in total

contradiction to their theory, and that the only method in which the two can be reconciled, is by assuming that the facts of creation were what their theory asserts, not what the Mosaic history declares, and that the language of the sacred text, therefore, is not to be considered as presenting the real history of the facts, but must be invested with a new and unnatural meaning. One division of them, accordingly, interpolates an immeasurable period between the first and second verses of Genesis i., and asserts that the real creation of the world took place in that period, not in the six days of the subsequent narrative. Another denies the legitimacy of that interpolation, and pronounces it equally irreconcilable with the narrative of Moses, and with the facts of geology; and asserts that the true solution of the difficulty is, that the six days of the creation, in place of being natural days, as they are explicitly defined in the narrative, were prolonged periods, probably of many thousand years; and admits and asserts, therefore, the reality of the conflict of the text with their theory, which it is their professed object to disprove or evade. A third party rejects this expedient, and affirms that the creation of the six days was not a creation of the races of plants and animals, generally, of the world at that epoch, but only of those of a small region lying north of the Persian Gulf that had for a short period been buried beneath the sea, and reduced to a state of disorder and ruin. These theories, wholly inconsistent with the sacred text, equally inconsistent in many respects with the facts of geology, founded on mere arbitrary assumptions, and severally rejected and denounced as untenable by large numbers of geologists themselves, necessarily leave the impression that no legitimate reconciliation of the theory of the great age of the world with the inspired history of the creation, is possible; and naturally drive those who regard that geological theory as demonstrated by scientific proofs, to the conclusion that the narrative in Genesis is not in accordance with fact, and thence that the Bible is not the word of God. Such has been the result, it is well known, and on a large scale, of the promulgation of these theories. Let any one become intimately acquainted with a community where they have been taught by zealous and popular lecturers, and he will



find that many of the young, especially, have been imbued by them with doubts of the inspiration of the Scriptures; and many led openly to reject them. Such notoriously is the effect of the writings of Dr. John Pye Smith, Dr. Hitchcock, and others of their class. Let any one converse with the sceptical, who have been educated in New England, the Middle, or the Western States, within the last ten or fifteen years, and learn what the considerations were which led them to renounce their faith in the inspiration and authority of the sacred volume; and he will find that these doctrines of Dr. Smith, Dr. Hitchcock, Hugh Miller, and their collaborators in the propagation of the system, were among the causes of their disbelief, and are among the reasons by which they justify it.

And these speculations are tending, we believe, more strongly to infidelity at the present time, than at any former period. Several causes contribute to bear them in that direction. The forwardness and eagerness with which many in the sacred office have given their assent to the theory of the vast age of the earth, and the confident and boastful air with which they have adopted and paraded these methods of vindicating the inspired history of the creation from the charge of confutation by geology, make a deep impression on the minds of many, either that they know nothing of the respect in which the Bible should be held, if it is truly believed to be the word of God; or else that they secretly feel that it is not susceptible of unanswerable vindication, and are willing to snatch at any pretext that for the moment may seem to save them from the disgrace of pursuing a profession that is a deception, and worthy only of the weak, the fanatical, and the unscrupulous. To what other conclusion can they naturally be led, when they see parties making great pretensions to learning, piety, and influence, resorting to expedients to reconcile the statements of the Scriptures with their geological theories, that in any other sphere would be deemed, in the utmost degree, disgraceful for their senselessness, arbitrariness, and violence?

The confutation of these attempts to bring the word of God into harmony with the geological theory, by the new facts that are brought to light by the progress of the science itself, excites a distrust of the ostentatious and boastful pre-

texts of these parties, and begets the feeling that no reliance is to be placed on any of the expedients by which they endeavor to shield the sacred volume from the discredit of confutation by geology. The discoveries of the last few years, for example, have shown, as Mr. M. states, that many of the species of plants and animals that now live on the globe, existed also when a portion of the deposits were formed which geologists assign to a period many ages anterior to the Mosaic epoch, and prove, therefore, that if the geological theory is correct, the creation of which Moses gives the history either cannot have been the creation of the present races of plants and animals, or else that their creation cannot have taken place at the time to which his history refers them. All the bold assumptions, the airy assertions, and the pompous declamation of Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Smith, Dr. Hitchcock, and others of that class, respecting a period of universal chaos, darkness, and death on the globe, immediately anterior to the Mosaic epoch, six thousand years ago, are, accordingly, completely set aside, and shown to be the merest fictions and delusions. What else can be expected to result from such an ignominious confutation of the expedient on which they so presumptuously ventured the vindication of the sacred word, than the feeling that all the other pretexts that are brought forward for the purpose, are equally hollow, and will in time meet a like refutation?

And finally, the same effect is likely to result from the discoveries that are said to have been made within a few years, of human relics in deposits that are referred by geologists to a period many ages anterior to the epoch of the Mosaic creation. It is maintained by geologists generally, who profess to regard the Scriptures as the word of God, that the introduction of man upon the earth took place at the epoch assigned to his creation by the history in Genesis i. Consequently, believing that the earth itself was called into existence, and peopled with plants and animals innumerable ages anterior to him, and that the strata in which their generations lie fossilized, were formed by slow processes, they maintain not only that the great bulk of the fossilized plants and animals had their being incalculable periods before the date of man's creation, but that the relics

of the huge animals that lie in the strata of the later tertiary periods, preceded him also by many thousands of years; and this results as necessarily from the principle on which their theory is founded, as their conclusion does that the formation of the other strata was the work of a gradual process, and occupied a vast series of ages. Facts, however, which have come to light within a few years, have proved that this branch of their scheme is mistaken, and shown that man co-existed with the mastodon and the other mammoth animals that were its contemporaries. It is stated in the Year Book of Facts for 1854, that at the meeting of the German Association for the Promotion of Science, at Tübingen, last September, it was announced that many human teeth, and several nearly perfect human skulls, had been found in the Swabian Alps, intermixed with the relics of the mastodon and other gigantic animals of the same period, and demonstrating that man existed contemporaneously with them. This discovery, verified by such proofs as to command the assent of the Association, overturns a vast amount of assumption and speculation by geologists on the subject. Sir Charles Lyell, for example, assigns the mastodon to a period more than 30,000 years ago. Referring to its relics found in several places in this State, he says:—

“It would be rash to infer, that these quadrupeds were mired in *modern times*, unless we use that term strictly in a geological sense. I have shown that there is a fluviatile deposit in the valley of the Niagara containing shells of the *Melania*, *Lymnea*, *Planorbis*, *Valvata*, &c., all of recent species, from which the bones of the great mastodon have been taken in a very perfect state. Yet the whole excavation of the ravine for many miles below the Falls has been slowly effected, since that fluviatile deposit was thrown down.

“Whether or not, in assigning a period of more than 30,000 years for the recession of the Falls from Queenstown to their present site, I have over or under estimated the time required for that operation, no one can doubt that a *vast number of centuries* must have elapsed before so great a series of geographical changes were brought about as have occurred since the entombment of this elephantine quadruped.”—*Manual of Elementary Geology*, p. 138.

To all those who continue to adhere to the theory that it was by slow processes that those geological changes were

wrought, on which the inference of the vast age of the world is founded, the discovery that man was contemporary with the mastodon, that is held to have flourished 30,000 years ago, will lead to the conclusion, not that these speculations in respect to the distance of the period when that animal flourished are incorrect, but that the narrative of Genesis, which represents that man was created but about six thousand years since, is mistaken, and therefore that neither the Pentateuch nor any other part of the sacred volume is inspired.

This result is openly revealed, indeed, by Agassiz, Nott, and others of that class. Professor Agassiz refers parts of a human skeleton, found in a conglomerate in Florida, to a date more than four thousand years anterior to the Mosaic epoch. Dr. Nott refers the skeleton of an Indian, disinterred in New Orleans, to more than 50,000 years before that period, and makes these supposed facts the ground of an open and insolent denial of the veracity of the history of the origin of the race in Genesis. And if any reliance is to be placed on the statements made in "The Types of Mankind," to which they are contributors, human relics have in a considerable number of instances been found both in Europe and on this continent, in conjunction with the bones of the mastodon, elephant, rhinoceros, and other contemporary animals, in the drift and other formations that are referred by geologists to periods long anterior to the date assigned by Moses to the creation; and whether they are authentic or not, they generally cannot be effectively disproved, and if they could, in the judgment of a certain class who wish to adhere to the Mosaic history of the creation of man, they cannot to all, and they will have the effect on a large proportion of minds which they would were they shown to be genuine by the most decisive evidence, and by all such will be considered as presenting as unanswerable a demonstration that man existed many thousands of years before the date assigned to the creation by Moses, as any other geological facts are, that the plants and animals that lie buried in the strata, existed many ages before that epoch. To all who admit the data, and assent to the principle on which the geologists build their inference respecting the age of the world, the conclusion against the late introduction of man

on the earth, is as unavoidable and imperative, as the conclusion is against the late creation of the fossilized animals and plants. As, therefore, discoveries of the kind continue to multiply, and rise, as they are likely to, to a more indisputable and emphatic character, the whole body of geologists will be forced either to abandon the entire ground on which they proceed in their speculations in reference to the age of the world, or else to pass into undisguised and unmitigated infidelity. That the last will be the issue with the young generally who have never had a firm faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures, there is no reason to doubt. Nor will it be likely to be confined to them. There is a large class who have become fanatics in geology, and who, having spent much of their lives in teaching their favorite theories respecting the formation of the strata, the immeasurable age of the world, and the claims of their speculations to the rank of a science, published books on the subject, and risen to a measure of conspicuity and popularity by their teachings;—when brought to the question whether they will publicly acknowledge that all their confident assumptions, reasonings, and declamation on the subject have been wholly mistaken, relinquish their reputation, and forego the prospect of further gains from their labors; or persevering in their deceptions, will give up Christianity—will, there is ground to fear, prefer to renounce the word of God, rather than themselves; and will then labor with as much zeal to carry their adherents with them, as they now do to imbue them with faith in their present theories. It were vain to imagine that men who now subject the word of God to such violent contortions and misrepresentations to answer their ends, will then be withheld by any delicate scruples, from renouncing it altogether as a fable, confuted by their boasted science.

ART. VI.—A DESIGNATION AND EXPOSITION OF THE  
FIGURES IN ISAIAH, CHAPTER XXVII.

THE prophecy of this chapter is shown to be a continuation of that of the preceding, by the statement, v. 1, that its events are to take place at the same period. The great events foretold in chap. xxvi. are the resurrection of the holy dead, the destruction of the great enemies of the Israelites, and the judgment of the nations. The predictions of this chapter are, first, the conquest of the great antagonists of God's people, Satan and the persecuting civil powers; and next, the song that is then to be sung by the Israelites, their re-establishment as a people, the desolation of the great rival powers by which they had been conquered; and finally, their complete restoration from dispersion.

1. Hypocatastasis. "In that day shall Jehovah with his hard, great, and strong sword visit upon leviathan the swift serpent, and upon leviathan the coiled serpent, and shall slay the dragon that is in the sea," v. 1. To visit with or bring the sword upon the serpent is used by substitution for inflicting on him a disabling blow, a defeat, by which he is to be disarmed and prevented from continuing his mischievous agency. The infliction on him is to differ, therefore, from that on the dragon, as the latter is not simply to be conquered and disarmed, but struck from life.

2, 3. Elliptical metaphors in denominating the powers, one of whom is thus to be conquered and the other slain, the serpent and the dragon. That they are not used literally is apparent from the fact that there is no single animal that bears the name of the swift and coiled serpent in distinction from all others of the serpent species, nor any single animal of the sea that is called the dragon in distinction from all others bearing that name. They are used by a metaphor as names of orders and combinations of agents in the intelligent world, or in relation to men generally that present an analogy to what such animals, were there such, would be to land and sea. By the serpent is doubtless meant Satan with his legions, who, in the Apocalypse, is denominated "that old serpent who is the devil and Satan." The event denoted by God's visiting him with his hard, great, and strong sword, is un-

doubtedly the same as that which is, in the Apocalypse, symbolized by his being seized, bound with a great chain, and shut up in the prison of hades during the thousand years of the saints' reign on the earth. By the dragon is meant as clearly the beast of seven heads and ten horns, who is called the dragon Rev. xii. 3, the symbol of the civil, usurping, and persecuting powers of the Roman empire down to its final fall at the coming of Christ, when the rulers whom the monster denotes are to be destroyed, Dan. vii. 9-13, Rev. xix. 11-21. If it is not the representative of the same powers as the ten-horned beast in its last form, which is distinguished, Rev. xiii., from the dragon, it must be considered as denoting the civil, persecuting rulers of the eastern Roman empire, of which, after the conquest of the western half by the Goths down to the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the dragon was the symbol; and then of the new empire that is to succeed that of the Turks in the east, and which, it seems to be shown by the re-appearance of the dragon, in the Apocalypse, at the last great conflict, is to be established there at the time of the emission of the unclean spirits, shortly before the effusion of the seventh vial. It probably denotes, therefore, the same power as the Gog and Magog of Ezekiel xxxviii., xxxix., who are, at the restoration of Israel, to be slain on the mountains of Palestine. That these are the agents meant by the serpent and dragon is made certain, moreover, by the fact that the time when these inflictions are to take place is that of Christ's advent, resurrection of the holy dead, and judgment of the nations, chap. xxvi. 12-21, when the antichristian civil and ecclesiastical powers are to be destroyed, and Satan is to be bound and imprisoned in hades.

4. Apostrophe. "In that day, sing ye of her," v. 2. The persons addressed are undoubtedly individuals, families, or communities of Israelites who can unite in the song; and those whom the garden of wine or vineyard denotes, are the Israelites collectively as God's chosen heritage. This is apparent from the close of the song, in which it is predicted that the descendants of Jacob shall take root like a flourishing vine, and Israel shall blossom and bud like the vines of a grape-bearing country, and fill the face of the world with fruit, v. 6.

5. Hypocatastasis in the substitution of a vineyard for God's chosen people, and of his acts in protecting the vineyard for his watching over and defending them. The song begins with "A garden of wine," or "A vineyard of wine," in which there is an ellipsis of a verb and pronoun, the sense being a garden of wine I have, or a garden of wine is mine:

"A garden of wine is mine,  
I Jehovah am keeping her,  
Every moment I will water her;  
Lest any hurt her  
Night and day will I keep her.  
Anger is not in me."—Va. 3, 4.

These are all acts of Jehovah, and they are used as representatives of analogous acts he will exert towards Israel as his chosen people:

"Who will set thorns and briers against me?  
In battle I would go through them,  
I would burn them together."—V. 4.

Thorns and briers are to a vineyard, what to God's people usurping apostates are who attempt to obstruct and destroy them, and substitute the wicked in their place. The meaning, accordingly, of the interrogatory, Who will set thorns and briers against me in my vineyard, is, Who will now raise a hostile party among my people, perverting them again to apostasy, and arraying them against me, like their corrupters in former days? And the assurance that he would instantly assail such thorns and briers with the instruments of extermination, and burn them together, signifies that were another attempt made to introduce apostates among his chosen people, instead of allowing them to live as he does under the present dispensation, and carry out their schemes of pride, ambition, and rivalry to him, he would instantly destroy them.

"Rather let him lay hold of my strength!  
Let him make peace with me!  
Peace let him make with me!"—V. 5.

5. Metonymy, of strength for God, whose strength it is of which his people are to take hold.



6. Hypocatastasis, in the substitution of taking hold of, for firmly relying on God. God is not to be literally taken hold of; but he is to be made the object of trust as firmly as though his power could be grasped by the hand, and made to yield an omnipotent protection.

7, 8, 9, 10, 11. Metaphors in the use of take root, bud, blossom, fill, and fruit. "In coming" time, "Jacob shall take root, Israel shall bud and blossom, and they shall fill the face of the earth with fruit," v. 6. From this period, that people, in place of being seduced into rebellion, as in former ages, and smitten with avenging judgments for their sins, are to continue in obedience and in the enjoyment of God's favor, and advance in numbers and in glory, like a vine that takes root in a fertile soil, where it is sheltered from injury, spreads itself on every hand, and fills the scene with the beauty of its foliage, and the luxuriance of its clusters. To fill the face of the land with fruit, is to make it abundant wherever there is room for it to grow, as a vessel is filled with the element that occupies all its space.

12. Metonymy of face—of the earth or land—for its surface. The song is thus one of the most beautiful in the sacred volume, both for the imagery it employs, and the gracious purposes it reveals; and it presents a very emphatic confutation of the views that are commonly entertained of the state of God's people during the millennium. Those generally who disbelieve that Christ is to reign on the earth during that period, have no expectation, even if they hold that the Israelites are to be restored to their ancient land, that their condition is then to be such as this prophecy foreshows. They very generally, at least, imagine that the state of Israelitish and Gentile believers is then to be very little better than at present, except that the nations will, in the main, be Christianized, that all persecution will cease, and that a larger measure of knowledge and virtue will prevail. That God will then watch over his chosen people, or the Gentile church, with the ceaseless vigilance and infinite tenderness which this song foreshows; that he will no longer inflict his wrath on his ancient people; that he will never again allow apostates to rise among them, and usurp his name and place; they have not the slightest conception. All their notions proceed on the supposition that men are to

be in much the state they now are; that the same human instrumentality is to be employed for the conversion of the unbelieving as is now used for the purpose; and that the agencies and schemes in which they are now engaged for the redemption of the world, are to be perpetuated for the purpose, and be the means of all the triumphs the gospel is ever to achieve.

The prophet next proceeds to show that the object for which God now chastises his people, is not like that with which he takes vengeance on their enemies, to destroy them, but to recall them from their idolatry, and purify them from their sins.

13, 14. Comparisons: "Has he smitten him, as he smote those that smote him; and is he slain, like the slaughter of those that slew him?" v. 7. Those who smote and slew Israel, are the nations that were the instruments of inflicting God's vengeance on them; the Philistines, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Moabites, and the Syrians. All these have been conquered by others, and swept from existence; and this accords with what is predicted in Jeremiah xxx. 11, "I am with thee, saith the Lord, to *save thee*: Though I make a *full end* of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee; but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished."

15. Hypocatastasis, in the substitution of hard wind—a short blast, a storm of but a day's continuance, for the analogous violent means by which the Israelites were driven into exile; "In measure, by sending her away, thou dost contend with her. He removes her by his hard wind in the day of the east wind," v. 8. The triumphs over them of the Assyrians, Babylonians, Egyptians, Moabites, and others, were but like the hot blasts from the desert, that for a moment prostrate those over whom they sweep, and strike the fields and gardens with blight; they were temporary, only, and were designed to punish and correct, not to destroy them.

16, 17, 18. Metaphors, in the use of purged, fruit, and take away: "Therefore by this shall Jacob's iniquity be purged, and this is all its fruit, to take away his sin," v. 9. They are to be purified by the judgments that are inflicted

on them; that is the effect that is sought by their chastisement; and the sins of which they are thus to be cured are especially those of idolatry.

19. Comparison of the destruction of their idol altars to the crushing of limestones that have been beaten to fragments or powder. This purification is to be accomplished, "When he makes all the stones of the altar, like limestones that are beaten asunder, and the groves and the images shall rise no more," v. 9; that is, when they have abandoned their idols, and demolished their altars. This was accomplished in respect to Judah, in a great measure, by the Babylonian captivity. It will be accomplished in respect to such of the ten tribes as may still be idolaters, on their restoration. But his judgments are to have a wholly different issue with their enemies, the Babylonians.

20. Comparison of the condition to which the defenced city is to be reduced, to a wilderness. "But the defenced city shall be desolate, an habitation forsaken, and deserted like a wilderness. There shall the calf feed, and there shall he lie down, and devour her branches. When her boughs are withered, they shall be broken; women shall come and set them on fire. Surely it is a people of no understanding; Therefore he that made them, will not have mercy on them; and he that formed them will show them no favor," v. 10, 11. The defenced city whose ruin is here foretold, is doubtless Babylon, to which the people of Judea were first carried captive, and which has for ages been reduced to the condition that is here described. What a contrast the fate of that proud capital and its cruel inhabitants present to Jerusalem and the Israelites! Babylon is never to be rebuilt; and of its population, not a trace remains. No people or tribe now subsists that bears their name, or traces to them its lineage. But the Israelites, notwithstanding all the awful judgments with which they have been smitten, survive in great numbers, continue a distinct lineage, and are again to be acknowledged as God's chosen people, and returned to their ancient land; their capital is to be rebuilt, and again be the scene of God's visible manifestation of himself; and they are to dwell and flourish there under his immediate rule as their king, for ever.

21. *Hypocatastasis*, in the use of beat off, as in gathering

the fruit of trees, for a careful collecting, or ingathering. "And it shall be in that day, that Jehovah shall beat off from the channel of the river to the stream of Egypt, and ye shall be gathered one by one, or every one, O ye children of Israel," v. 12. The day here designated, is the day of Babylon's total desolation. The ingathering of the Israelites here foreshown, is therefore yet future; as at the time of the return of the Babylonian exiles, that city had not been reduced to such a state of desolation; nor was it till a long period after. The channel of the river is the channel of the Euphrates. The stream of Egypt is not the Nile, but a small stream near the border of Egypt towards Palestine.

22. Hypocatastasis. "And it shall be in that day, a great trumpet shall be blown, and they shall come that were lost in the land of Assyria, and those cast out in the land of Egypt, and shall bow down to Jehovah in the holy mountain in Jerusalem," v. 13. The blowing of a great trumpet is probably used by substitution for some analogous means, by which the Israelites are to be summoned to return to their national land, as in chapter ix. it is said that Christ is then to stand as a signal to them, and in chapter lxvi. that he is then to give a sign. It indicates that the restoration is yet future; as no such trumpet blast, as far as is known, nor any other signal answering to it, was employed to summon the Israelites to commence their journey to Judea, on their return from their captivity at Babylon.

This prophecy then, like many others, foreshows that at the time of the resurrection of the holy dead, which is to be at the time of Christ's coming and judgment of the nations, the great powers that are arrayed against his kingdom, Satan and his angels, and the apostate and usurping civil rulers of Christendom, are the one to be disabled, and the other destroyed, so that they can offer no further obstruction to his reign; that then the Israelites are to be gathered from their dispersion, and become worshippers of Jehovah at Jerusalem; and that he is thereafter to watch over them with infinite tenderness and care, and prevent them from ever again being seduced to a false worship.

ART. VII.—THE TACTICS OF A CLASS OF ULTRA-PARTY  
ANTIMILLENARIANS.

IN the article in the April number of the Journal, on Christ's Second Coming, after alleging a series of passages from the prophets, showing that his "second coming and the commencement of his reign over the nations are to take place at the time of the restoration of the Israelites and destruction of the hostile powers that endeavor to retain them in subjection," we added :

"The contemporaneousness of these events is revealed also, Zech. ix. :

"Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just and having salvation, lowly and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass. And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off: and he shall speak peace unto the heathen; and his dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth.'—Vs. 9-10.

"But when is the King of Zion thus to come to her, destroy all the implements of war, and extend his dominion over the whole earth? When he delivers the Israelites from their captivity, vs. 11, 12, and restores them to their own land, v. 16."

The passage from Zechariah, the reader will perceive, is a two-fold prediction: first, that Christ their king should come to the *people* of Jerusalem, denominated the daughter of Zion; and secondly, that when he had thus come to them, he should display certain characteristics and exert certain acts. He was to be just and having salvation; he was to be lowly and riding upon an ass. He was to cut off the chariot from Ephraim, the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow; that is, he was to destroy the hostile hosts that were there to be assembled against the Israelites, as is foreshown in several predictions we had previously quoted; or, if it is thought more probably the meaning of the prophecy,—he was to put an end to the use of the implements of war, and cause them to be converted into instruments of husbandry, as is foreshown Isaiah ii. 4: and he was to speak peace unto the heathen, and was to extend his dominion from

sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. All these are predictions of acts that were to be exerted by him, and characteristics he was to display *after he had come to the people of Jerusalem*. There is no hint in them what *the mode was to be* in which *he was to come from heaven*. The prediction that he should "ride upon an ass, and upon the foal of an ass" is not a prediction of the mode in which he was to *descend from heaven* at his incarnation or his second advent. It is a prophecy of an act he was to exert *after he had come from heaven*, and it had its fulfilment after his first advent in his riding into Jerusalem on an ass, as recorded Matt. xxi. 1-5. It was not necessary for us to state that it is not a prediction of the mode in which he was to descend from heaven, as every reader of the Bible knows that it is a prophecy solely of the mode in which, after his advent, he was to enter Jerusalem. It was not necessary for us to state that it had its accomplishment immediately before his crucifixion, as that also is known to every reader of the New Testament.

The prediction, however, that the King of Zion was to enter Jerusalem riding upon an ass, and the literal fulfilment of that prophecy in Christ's entering the city in that manner, show that his *coming*, which is foretold in the passage, is a *personal coming*, and that the acts that are predicted of him are *personal and visible acts*; and that is the reason that we quoted v. 9. Had we merely transcribed v. 10, which is yet to be accomplished, the reader would have been left without the proof which the preceding verse furnishes, that the acts which it foreshows are to be exerted by Christ *in person and when visibly present*.

When we asked, therefore, "But when is the King of Zion thus to come to her, destroy all the implements of war, and extend his dominion over the whole earth? our meaning was, When is he *to come thus in person and visibly*, and exert those great acts that are yet future; *i. e.* destroy the anti-christian hosts who are to be gathered together against the Israelites at Jerusalem, or put an end to the implements of war, speak peace to the heathen, and extend his dominion over the whole earth? This is not only the proper meaning of the question, but it is the only one that can be put on it consistently either with our language, or with the nature of the prediction to which it refers; for verses 9 and 10 do not con-

tain a hint in respect to the mode in which Christ was to descend from heaven at his first advent, or is to come at his second: nor did we utter a syllable implying that we regard them as indicating the mode of his advent, either at his incarnation or his second coming.

What the mode, however, is to be in which he is to come when he exerts the acts, which are yet future, foreshown, v. 10, is clearly indicated in a subsequent part of the prophecy; and we quoted it accordingly and explained it as showing that he is then to come "*visibly in the clouds,*" and "destroy their enemies" by his "devouring lightnings." After presenting vs. 11-13, as showing that when the prediction, v. 10, is fulfilled, the Israelites are to be released from captivity, and summoned to return to their ancient capital, and prepared to be used as God's instruments in destroying their enemies, we added: "Then shall Jehovah *visibly appear* for their deliverance, and flash his devouring lightnings on their foes:" and quoting vs. 14-16, in which it is predicted, "AND THE LORD SHALL BE SEEN OVER THEM, *his arrow shall go forth as lightning, and the Lord shall blow the trumpet and shall go with whirlwinds of the south,*" v. 14, we explained it as foreshowing that "their restoration is to take place WHEN JEHOVAH COMES VISIBLY IN THE CLOUDS, and darting his lightnings on the hosts arrayed against them, gives them a final deliverance from their power; and that is to be at the commencement of Christ's millennial reign, when he puts an end for ever to war, and extends his peaceful and gracious reign over all the nations of the world." While thus we uttered no intimation whatever that we regard v. 9 as indicating the mode in which Christ is to come from heaven at his second advent, we expressly showed that we suppose it to be indicated, v. 14, and that it is to be A PERSONAL AND VISIBLE COMING IN THE CLOUDS WITH FLAMING FIRE, according to the constant predictions of the Scriptures respecting it.

All this is so plain from our terms and mode of expression, is in such consistency with the passage, and in such harmony with all that we had said in other parts of the same article, and other references to the subject, that we know not how any person of ordinary intelligence could fail to see it; or any upright and prudent one could ven-

ture to deny it. A writer, however, in the "Christian Intelligencer," published in this city, of the 20th April, charges us with teaching in it, that Christ at his second advent is to come from heaven "riding upon an ass." The following is the article:

"EXPOSITION OF PROPHECY.

"In the Theological and Literary Journal for April, there is an article by the Editor on 'Christ's Second Coming.' He cites very many passages from the prophets, descriptive, as he supposes, of the Saviour's future advent. Among these is found (page 553) the well-known utterance of Zechariah (ix. 9): 'Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass,' &c. Mr. D. N. Lord's interpretation of this passage is a startling novelty. 1. The Lord Jesus told his disciples that he would come in the clouds of heaven; but if, when he so comes, he is to be 'riding upon an ass,' on what is that ass supposed to stand? Or if the mode of equitation is symbolical, what does it symbolize? 2. The Redeemer said that he would come in the glory of his Father, and all the holy angels with him. How does this description consist with the term 'lowly' in Zechariah? Can lowliness in any degree be ascribed to one who sits on the great white throne and judges the quick and the dead? 3. The Apostle Matthew, in his Gospel (xxi. 1-5), describes Christ's mission of two disciples to Bethphage to procure an ass with a colt, for him to ride upon, and then adds: 'All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass.' It appears, then, that Matthew was of one mind on this subject, and Mr. Lord is of another. The former declares that Zechariah's prediction referred to Christ's first advent, and was then fulfilled; the latter cites it as foretelling his second coming. Most persons would conclude at once that Matthew was right; but that is by no means certain according to prevailing theories. Perhaps the Evangelist did not understand the laws of prophetic symbols, was laboring under 'an astounding hallucination,' or lacked the true key to the interpretation of the Old Testament. Yet on the whole we prefer to stick to Matthew. Since he was taught by the Lord Jesus and inspired by the Holy Ghost, it is possible that he knew more about the explanation of Scripture than any modern expounder, however learned, or confident, or fluent, or dogmatical."

We think our readers will agree with us, that a more



unprovoked and glaring misrepresentation is not often put forth even by the most unscrupulous, nor one bearing on its face more decisive marks that it is the offspring of malevolence. 1. The accusation is gratuitous and false. Not a word is uttered by us, as we have already shown, either implying, or susceptible of being tortured into an implication, that we suppose the prediction that Christ was to ride into Jerusalem upon an ass, is a prediction of the mode in which he is to descend from heaven at his second coming. 2. It is not only without any ground and false, but it was penned in the presence of the most specific and ample evidence that it is false; as we expressly stated on the same page, as already shown, that we regard v. 14 as indicating that Christ is at his second advent "*to come visibly IN THE CLOUDS,*" according to the prediction Dan. vii. 13; Rev. i. 7, and other passages; and that view of the mode of his coming is presented by us, moreover, in numerous passages in that and the preceding article on the subject, as well as in all others in which we have treated of his coming. The author of the accusation, therefore, cannot excuse himself under the pretext, that he had no means of knowing that our view of the manner of Christ's second advent is not that which he ascribes to us. He penned his misrepresentation with the clearest evidence under his eye that it is false; he penned it, undoubtedly also, with a knowledge that we had in previous parts of the discussion, expressly stated and demonstrated from the prophets, that Christ is at his second advent to come "in the clouds of heaven," "with power and great glory." 3. It is not necessary, therefore, to allege any further evidence that his motive was bad. The upright do not forge and publish injurious accusations with the proofs before them, that they are false. Animated by a deep hostility to Christ's premillennial coming, this writer, probably, found a malignant gratification in thus venting his spleen at it, and perhaps thought it a brave and witty exploit to invent and promulgate a charge so adapted, if believed, to disgrace the doctrine and those who advocate it. Unhappily he is but one of a class who resort to that unwarrantable method of assailing what they cannot confute. 4. There is no ground on which he can be supposed to believe that we regard the prediction of Christ's

entering Jerusalem "riding upon an ass," as indicating the mode of his descent from heaven at his second advent, unless he himself regards it as a prediction of the manner of his coming from heaven at his incarnation. For let him admit that it is a mere prophecy of the mode in which Christ was to enter Jerusalem thirty years *after* his incarnation; and not the shadow of a pretext then exists for his assertion that we cite it as a prediction of the mode of his coming at his second advent. If he holds that it has no reference to Christ's descent from the skies, how can he, without a syllable from us to warrant it, assert that we quote it as foretelling the manner of Christ's descent from heaven at his second coming? Unless, therefore, he penned his accusation with a perfect consciousness of its falsehood, we see not but that he must have proceeded under the impression that the prophecy of Christ's entering Jerusalem "riding upon an ass," is a prophecy that he was to descend from heaven on that animal at his incarnation—the very blunder he falsely ascribes to us! He, accordingly, says: "It appears that Matthew was of one mind on this subject, and Mr. Lord is of another. The former declares that Zechariah's prediction referred to Christ's *first advent*, and was then fulfilled; the latter cites it as foretelling his second coming." He here thus actually treats it as a prediction of the mode of Christ's "first advent." What admirable qualifications he displays for the task he has undertaken! What exquisite proofs he gives of his power by a single dash of his pen, not only to overturn our constructions and arguments, but to infuse a new meaning into the prophets and evangelists! "Yet on the whole we prefer to stick to Matthew. Since he was taught by the Lord Jesus, and inspired by the Holy Ghost, it is possible that he knew more about the explanation of Scripture than any modern expounder, however learned, or confident, or fluent, or dogmatical."

Soon after the appearance of the charge, we sent to the editor of the *Intelligencer* a vindication of ourselves from his misrepresentation. He, however, not only refused to insert it, but repeated the accusation. It was our intention to publish that reply in the present number of the *Journal*, but want of space obliges us to postpone it, and a fuller

exposition of the tactics of which this calumny is a specimen, to a future occasion. In the mean time the foregoing statement will show our readers what judgment they are to form of our accuser, of the principles on which the *Intelligencer* is conducted, and of the condition to which the cause of our opponents is reduced, who feel that such dishonorable expedients have become necessary for its support.

---

ART. VIII.—LITERARY AND CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. AN ORIGINAL HARMONY AND EXPOSITION of the Twenty-Fourth Chapter of Matthew, and the parallel Passages of Mark and Luke, comprising a Review of the Common Figurative Theories of Interpretation, with a practical examination of the principal passages relating to the Second Coming of Christ, the End of the World, the New Creation, the Millennium, the Resurrection, the Judgment, the Conversion and Restoration of the Jews, the Final Gathering of the Elect, &c., &c.: by Rev. D. D. Buck. Auburn, Derby & Miller; Buffalo, Derby, Orton & Mulligan. 1853.

THIS is a highly valuable contribution to the interpretation of the prophetic Scriptures, alike on account of the strong sense and large knowledge of the sacred word which it displays; the soundness and importance of the principles on which it proceeds; the truth with which it sets forth the meaning of the great prophecy of Christ respecting his second coming; and the fidelity and force with which it exposes the misconstructions and misrepresentations to which the revelation Christ there makes, has been and is still generally subjected by commentators. No more unscholarly and unwarrantable expedients have ever been resorted to by expositors, to wrest the language of inspiration from its plain and indubitable meaning, than are employed to force on that prediction a false and absurd sense. And we have not often seen a more effective confutation of such perversions, and vindication of the truth, than this volume presents.

Mr. Buck introduces his work with a Harmony of the Prophecy in parallel columns, as it is given by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in which in the record by Matthew, all the passages from Mark and Luke, containing additional particulars and different forms of expression, are inserted at the points which he supposes them to have occupied, as the discourse was uttered by Christ.

One of the principal peculiarities of his view of the prophecy is, that he regards its predictions as arranged in the order in which the events they foreshow were and are to take place. He holds, accordingly, that the predictions down to the fourteenth verse of Matthew, were verified before the siege of Jerusalem foreshown in the fifteenth verse, and that the preaching of the gospel in all the world for a witness unto all nations, predicted v. 14, was the preaching of the apostolic age during which Paul represents it as having been proclaimed "in all the world," and "preached to every creature." Expositors generally, who agree in the main with Mr. Buck in the construction of the prophecy, regard the prediction, v. 10-14, as descriptive of apostasies, persecutions, and delusions of later ages, and the end which is to be preceded by the preaching of the gospel to all nations, as the end of the present dispensation, which is to be terminated by Christ's coming in the clouds of heaven; and they have very strong reasons for their construction, as our readers will see, who refer to Mr. Carleton's analysis of the chapter, noticed in the *Journal*, July, 1851. The apostasy described, v. 10-12, seems far greater and more general than any that occurred during the first forty years of the apostles' ministry.

The predictions, v. 15-28, he regards as relating to the siege and destruction of Jerusalem, and the period that immediately followed; and Luke xxi. 24, "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled," which he inserts in his Harmony, after v. 28 of Matthew, as extending the history down to the close of the period of Gentile domination, which is to terminate a short time before Christ's second coming; and this, in which he concurs with millenarian interpreters generally, he sustains by the most ample proofs. The calamities with which the Jews were overwhelmed, from the invasion by the Romans to the conquest and devastation of Jerusalem, the most terrible of which were inflicted by the bands of robbers and cut-throats of their own nation that ravaged the country, and the factions that distracted the city, and robbed, outraged, and slaughtered a vast portion of its inhabitants, answered to the prediction, v. 16-22; and at that period many false Christs or impostors pretending to be Christ, appeared, or were reported to have appeared, in the wilderness, and in the chambers of the temple.

The darkening of the sun and moon, and fall of stars, predicted Matthew, v. 29, he holds are to take place immediately after the close of the Jewish tribulation at the end of the times of the Gentiles, and are to be literal. In this he is undoubtedly correct. Antimillenarian commentators regard the language as figurative,

and representative of the fall of Jerusalem. But there is no figure whatever in the language; and if there were, there is nothing in it that can connect it with the fall of Jerusalem. The events are predicted of the sun, moon, and stars. If the verbs then were used by a metaphor, those luminaries would be the subjects of the events which the metaphors would be employed to foreshow. Had the darkening of the sun and moon, and fall of the stars, been employed to illustrate the devastation of Jerusalem, God would probably have been exhibited as the agent in producing those effects in those celestial bodies, and in connexion with a prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, that would have shown that his acts on the sun, moon, and stars, were employed to represent acts he was to exert on that city, precisely as in describing the destruction of the royal family of Egypt by a similar figure, God is exhibited as the agent—"And when *I quench thee*"—the king of Egypt—"I will cover the heavens, and I will cause the stars thereof to be black. I will cover the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give her light. All the shining lights of the heavens, I will clothe with black over thee, and I will set darkness upon thy land, saith the Lord Jehovah,"—Ezekiel xxxii. 7, 8; where Jehovah is the agent, and the use of the metaphor in introducing it, exhibiting the king of Egypt as a luminary which God will *quench*, shows that the whole is a substitution of the lights of heaven for the members of the royal family of Egypt, and the extinction of the sun, and darkening of the moon and stars, are employed to represent the extinction of the monarch by death, and the dispossession of the inferior princes of their power, and subjection to the condition of subjects and dependants. There is a similar prediction of the darkening of the sun, moon, and stars, Joel ii. 10, iii. 15, at the same period, and it is to be during that darkness, probably, that the sign of the Son of Man is to appear in heaven, and he is to be seen coming in the clouds with power and great glory.

Verses 30 and 31 he accordingly treats as a literal prediction of the coming of Christ in the clouds, sending forth his angels, and gathering together his elect; and this is the most original and important part of the volume, from the clear and resistless confutation which it presents of the false construction placed on the passage by the writers who exhibit it as a mere figurative prediction of a providential coming of Christ to the destruction of Jerusalem, and demonstration that the event it foreshows is Christ's second coming and gathering together his elect people. A more effective and humiliating exposure of the inconsideration, the lawlessness, and the blunders which mark the false figurative writers in the exposition of the sacred word, we have not often seen. Mr. Buck confutes their construction of the passage, 1. By showing that there are no figures in

it. This he does quite effectively, though far less than he might had he tried the question by the laws of the metaphor which have been frequently stated in the Journal. 2. By showing that the prediction cannot respect the overthrow of Jerusalem, inasmuch as it is expressly announced in it that it is to be *after* the close of the Jewish tribulation which is to extend down to the end of the times of the Gentiles that have not yet reached their termination,—that the darkening of the sun and moon is to take place, and the stars are to fall from heaven. On what principle can a prediction of changes of the sun, moon, and stars, the period of which is now known to be near 1800 years after the fall of Jerusalem, be held to be predictions of the overthrow of that capital? 3. By showing that there is no correspondence whatever, as these commentators assert, between the mode in which the Romans entered Judea and conquered Jerusalem, and the suddenness and conspicuity of Christ's coming, or the direction in which he is first to become visible, as they are indicated, v. 27, "As the lightning cometh out of the east and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." The figurative interpreters have asserted, with the utmost assurance, that that presents an exact parallel to the mode in which the Roman armies entered Judea and conquered Jerusalem; and their expositions derive from the statement the whole of even the faint appearance they can boast of conformity to the truth. Mr. Buck, however, denies it. After alleging passages from a number of writers in which they make that statement—Newton, Coke, Clarke, Scott, Watson, Whitby, Barnes—he says, "There is no truth or semblance of truth in these quotations so far as they relate to the history of the coming and conquest of the Romans. Not only is there no truth in them, but in respect to the point in question, they are diametrically *opposite* to the truth in every important particular. The whole thing is a fiction, with hardly a sufficiency of foundation truth to be called a romance. The positive affirmations are proved to be without truth by the very authorities which are appealed to." And he verifies the statement by the most ample proofs from the history of the war by Josephus.

The term *γῆσα*, in the 34th verse, translated in the common version, generation, he regards as denoting race, lineage; and he supports his views by a strong array of considerations. There are, however, formidable objections to it. An assurance that the Israelitish race should not pass away till all the events predicted in Christ's discourse shall be accomplished, appears unnatural. It would seem to imply that *then* that people would or might pass away. But instead of being the epoch of their extinction, Christ's coming is to be the epoch of their redemption and establishment in their national land. It would seem to imply that there were no assurances in the

Old Testament that the Israelites were to continue a people through so long a period as the prophecy assigns to the domination of the Gentiles; whereas it is foreshown in a great number of promises and predictions in the ancient Scriptures, that after their restoration, they are never again to be smitten with avenging judgments, but are to continue, in an endless series of generations, to dwell in their land, and flourish in righteousness and bliss under the reign of their Messiah. The term "this generation" refers obviously to the generation who are to witness the signs of Christ's coming, his coming itself, and the gathering of his elect. It is they who see the signals which, like the budding and blossoming that precede the summer, are to announce his approach, v. 33, that are not to pass away till all the events he had predicted as to follow the great tribulation shall have come to pass, as is seen from vs. 36-42, where the time to which v. 34 refers is defined to be that of Christ's coming.

Mr. Buck illustrates and confirms his views of the prophecy by the parallel predictions in other parts of the sacred volume, and shows that the great scheme which it discloses of the divine purposes to the Israelites and the Gentiles, down to the time of Christ's second coming, harmonizes with that which is everywhere presented in the Old and the New Testament.

We recommend to our readers to purchase and study the volume. There are some few things from which they probably will dissent, but in the main it will command their concurrence, and confirm their faith in the great doctrine of Christ's speedy coming, and reign over his millennial kingdom. Mr. Buck makes none of the ostentatious pretensions to learning which are now fashionable with writers who aspire to the reputation of critical commentators; but in sound sense, thoroughness of investigation, and a true knowledge of the word of God, he is far superior to such writers as Stuart, Barnes, and a crowd of others of the same class, who, in fact, instead of studying the word of God, bestow their chief attention on grammars, dictionaries, and commentators, and whose labors, accordingly, result in little else than a feeble, confused, and often self-contradictory reproduction of the ideas of others, in place of a fresh, original, and fuller unfolding of the sacred text itself.

2. HISTORY OF THE FRENCH PROTESTANT REFUGEES, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to our own days, by M. Charles Weiss, Professor of History in the Lycée Bonaparte. Translated from the French by Henry William Herbert, with an American Appendix by a Descendant of the Huguenots. In two volumes. New York: Stringer & Townsend. 1854.

THIS work treats with eminent thoroughness, impartiality, and judg-

ment, a subject of great interest, of which we before had no single complete history. The narrative of the persecution to which the French Protestants were subjected under the rule of Louis XIV. and XV., the heroic fortitude with which thousands of them submitted to the rack, the axe, the pyre, and the still worse tortures of the prisons and galleys, and the steadfastness with which vast multitudes, who escaped destruction by those engines, maintained their allegiance, and at the loss of their earthly possessions and the disruption of their tenderest earthly ties, fled amidst appalling dangers to the neighboring countries for refuge, is one of the most touching in the range of human history. But the incidents that marked their reception in the Christian communities in which they found a new home, are scarcely less exciting, and the story of the part which they acted during the century that followed their exile less adapted to awaken interest and inspire a high admiration of their courage, their learning, and their social and religious virtues. They changed the history of every country in which they settled in large numbers, not only in respect to manufactures and commerce, but in an important measure in respect to war, to politics, to learning, and to religion. Such was the fact especially in Great Britain; the army being formed of them, in a large measure, through which William III. achieved the defeat of James II., and gained for Protestantism the supremacy it has since that period enjoyed.

The plan of the history is simple and comprehensive; detailing, in separate chapters, the measures by which the Refugees were received and established in the countries to which they fled, and the influence they exerted on manufactures, agriculture, and commerce; on politics, on learning, and on religion; and tracing their career, till they ceased to exist as a distinct people. The narrative abounds with great and touching incidents, and with portraits of distinguished preachers, men of learning, and the nobles and others who were devoted to the profession of arms, that are eminently beautiful. The work will find a host of delighted readers not only among the descendants of those illustrious men, but among all who sympathize with the martyrs of freedom and religion in their sufferings, admire the splendor of their virtues, and love to contemplate the wisdom with which divine providence confounds the enemies of Christianity, and makes their attempts to exterminate it and the blessings which it generates and nourishes, the means of giving it a wider diffusion and firmer establishment.

3. **A MANUAL OF ELEMENTARY GEOLOGY**, or the Ancient Changes of the Earth and its Inhabitants, as illustrated by Geological Monuments, by Sir Charles Lyell, M.A., F.R.S. Reprinted from



the fourth and revised edition. Illustrated with Five Hundred Woodcuts. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1854.

THE subject of this work—unlike that of the author's *Principles of Geology*—is *the early changes* of the earth and its inhabitants. It treats of the various strata of the crust of the earth, the elements of which they severally consist, the animal and vegetable fossils which they imbed, and the supposed forces and processes by which they were formed and thrown into their present positions. It presents a vast array of interesting and important facts; exemplifies the reasonings on which geologists found their theories of the age of the world; and eminently simple and graphic in its descriptions, clear in its statements, and systematic and comprehensive in its views, is one of the most agreeable, and most indispensable of the numerous works that have lately appeared on the subject, to those who desire to make themselves acquainted with the present state of the science.

4. VOICES OF THE DEAD. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D., Minister of the Scottish National Church, Crown Court, Covent Garden. Boston: J. P. Jewett & Co. Cleveland, Ohio: Jewett, Proctor & Worthington. 1854.
5. VOICES OF THE DAY. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. Boston: J. P. Jewett & Co. 1854.
6. BENEDICTIONS, OR THE BLESSED LIFE. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. Boston: J. P. Jewett & Co. 1854.

THE publishers have rendered an important service to the cause of truth and piety in reprinting and giving a wide diffusion to these volumes, the work of a mind of superior powers, ardent attachment to the great doctrines of the gospel, and zealous devotion to the work of his office. Dr. Cumming is at present the most eloquent and popular preacher of Great Britain, and as distinguished for the fearlessness as he is for the power and skill with which he attacks the current errors of the day. His eloquence is not of the high order of a Bossuet, a Bourdaloue, or a Robert Hall, that raises the reader or hearer to an elevation with which he is almost unfamiliar, and which strains and overtakes his powers,—a greatness and beauty of thought, and a vastness of comprehension, which the genius of the orator himself is needed fully to appreciate. Instead, its sphere is that of the thoughts and emotions with which the religiously educated are generally familiar; and it lies in a peculiar ease, vividness, and force in presenting the topics which he treats, skill in setting them forth in their most attractive and imposing attitudes, and a power of touching the springs

of memory, of fancy, and of feeling in such a manner as to call up all the associated thoughts that attach to them, invest them with interest, and give them possession of the heart. His conceptions are clear, arranged in a natural order, and perspicuously expressed. He grasps the main features of the subjects which he discusses, and presents them in a bold outline. But his chief power lies in his quick and comprehensive perception of their relations to other subjects, and the ease, copiousness, and grace with which he illustrates and adorns them by resemblances and contrasts. He has a vigorous fancy, paints with great vividness, especially with the brilliant hues of the comparison and the metaphor, and makes all his reasonings, his delineations, and his appeals the vehicle of conveying the great truths of the gospel to the intellect, and impressing them on the heart.

The titles of these volumes indicate the general character of their subjects. The topics treated in each, though closely associated, are sufficiently various, and are presented with an ease, an amplitude of illustration, and an ardor of feeling that render them eminently pleasing and impressive. We trust these volumes will obtain a wide diffusion.

7. *THE ETERNAL DAY*, by the Rev. Horatius Bonar, D.D. Kelso. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1854.

THIS volume exemplifies the author's usual method of presenting the subjects which he treats,—not by an analysis of principles, original and far reaching views, or a demonstrative course of reasoning; but with a reference to readers who need rather to be reminded of truths of which they already have a measure of knowledge than taught them for the first time,—by plain, pointed, antithetic, and stirring statements and remarks; a recital of the principal passages of the sacred word which relate to the theme, and an exhibition of them in all the various attitudes and relations in which they can be contemplated, with such counsels, warnings, and exhortations as are adapted to give them a proper impression on the heart. He treats in this work of “the ages to come,” their stability and endlessness, their life, light, love, and consolation; their service, their city, their temple, and their song;—a delightful subject, presented with much spirit, and now and then garnished with thoughts of eminent beauty.

8. *THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS*, with an Introduction by Edward Hitchcock, D.D., President of Amherst College. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

THE author's object in this volume is to prove that the earth is the

only world that is inhabited by intelligent creatures; that all the other spheres that fill the immeasurable spaces around us, are either mere chaotic masses, or at most only peopled with animals, and of the lowest orders. Though not fully accepted by Dr. Hitchcock, he mainly assents to it, and endorses it as an "auxiliary" to "religion," because it recognises, and in a large degree proceeds on the geological theory which he maintains. He must feel, we think, that "religion" stands in extreme need of an "auxiliary," to accept such a co-operator.

The writer's professed aim in endeavoring to prove that this is the only world that is inhabited by intelligent beings, is to free religion from the objection sometimes advanced by infidels, that the earth is not of sufficient significance in bulk to be distinguished as the theatre of a moral administration. The ground, however, which he occupies, is that of mere deism, and of the faintest and most unsentimental cast; not that of a believer, earnest and undoubting, in the Christian revelation. His recognition of a moral government, a moral law, and a revelation made to reason, is of the weakest and vaguest character. The objection to religion, accordingly, which he proposes to set aside, is an objection supposed to be made by an absolute sceptic to even a natural religion, such as a deist recognises; not the objection treated by Dr. Chalmers in his astronomical discourses, made by infidels against Christianity,—that the nothingness of the earth, compared to the universe at large, renders it incredible that it should be made the scene of such a work of redemption, as that which the Scriptures represent Christ as having become incarnate to accomplish. The objection, therefore, which the author aims to answer, is a mere factitious one. Probably no human being ever felt it. No one, at any rate, can consistently doubt that man is the subject of a providential and moral government, to the extent which the deist admits he is, unless he absolutely denies either that he is a moral being, or else that he is the work of an intelligent creator. The real drift of the author, accordingly, is not to vindicate Christianity, or even deism, from objection; but to show that the empire of the creator is essentially a mere physical empire; that the intelligent and moral element in it is but an exception, and on so small a scale, as not to be entitled to consideration. In other words, his aim is to write religion out of God's kingdom, or reduce it to the minutest and most insignificant term; not to relieve it from perplexity, and establish it on a firm basis.

He accordingly maintains with the utmost coolness, on the grounds of mere observation and natural knowledge, that man is the only intelligent and moral creature in the universe, and that this world is his only residence. This is, of course, on the basis of mere deism,

and in disregard of the explicit revelation made in the Scriptures, that there are other intelligences, and of numerous orders, and some of them, at least, of bodies that differ from those of men, Col. i. 15, 21; 1 Cor. xv. 40-45. His arguments are drawn first, from our inability to discover other intelligences by our eyes, unaided, or by the telescope; next, from the current theory of geology, which ascribes a vast period to the earth of mere chaos, or inhabitation by animals and plants anterior to the creation of man; and lastly, from the nebular theory, which represents the formation of the heavenly bodies as the result of a law, instead of the immediate fiat of the creator. He sets aside the whole of the Scriptures, therefore, as geologists do the first chapter of Genesis, and reasons exclusively from what he sees, or from what he does not see; not from what God reveals. His argument is, consequently, a mere piece of special pleading; and though in a measure specious and imposing, is wholly inconclusive, and often sophistical, and self-contradictory, in a degree little creditable to his candor. He blows hot or cold with identically the same considerations, as best subserves his purposes. His aim is much the same, we think, as that of the author of the *Vestiges of Creation*, though he veils it more adroitly; and the effect of his work on those who accept its teachings, will be to lessen their sense of the significance and reality of God's moral government, and make it the object of indifference and doubt.

9. *MEDITATIONS ON THE LAST DAYS OF CHRIST*; together with Eight Meditations on the Seventeenth Chapter of John, by W. G. Schauffler, Missionary to Constantinople. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. Cleveland, Ohio: Jewett, Proctor & Worthington. London: Sampson, Son & Co. 1854.

THE subjects of these meditations are among the most interesting presented in the sacred volume, and demand for their just exhibition a true knowledge of God, comprehensive views of the work of redemption, and a heart of deep sensibility. Mr. Schauffler possesses these qualifications in far more than an ordinary degree; ample learning without the pedantry which disfigures many of the works that treat critically of the gospel; large experience; and a deep realization of the import of Christ's death and resurrection, and the grandeur of the kingdom he is to establish and sway as the King of kings, and Lord of lords. He has studied the themes which he treats with earnest attention, and reveals the impressions they have made on him in the glow of his emotions, as well as in the truth and beauty of his thoughts. They are peculiarly suited to awe and soften the heart, and kindle it with wonder, gratitude, and love.

They are eminently adapted, when contemplated aright, to unfold to the eye, at once the ruin from which Christ came to redeem us, the perfection and beauty of the life to which he designs to raise us, and the vastness and glory of the results that are to spring from his mediation. No one can read these pages without a deeper feeling of the wonderfulness of Christ's work, and the greatness and sanctity of his claims to our faith, adoration, and service. They are especially suitable to be read in preparation for the commemoration of his death. The scenes are presented in a natural, life-like manner, and the style is vivacious and stirring.

10. *MEMOIR OF THE REV. OLIVER ALDEN TAYLOR, of Manchester, Massachusetts*, by Timothy Alden Taylor. Second edition. Boston: John P. Jewett & Co. Cleveland, Ohio: Jewett, Proctor & Worthington. 1854.

THIS is a highly interesting narrative of the life and death of a cultivated, ardent, and successful evangelical minister, with a pleasing picture of a wide circle of relatives and friends of a kindred spirit, who shared in his joys and sorrows. After completing his education at Schenectady and Andover, and devoting several years to literary and theological pursuits at the latter place, he was settled in Manchester, Massachusetts, and continued in the ministry there till his death in 1851. What an infinite train of blessings pious and faithful parents are sometimes made the instruments of transmitting to their offspring! What a harvest of gifts and joys such parents are sometimes given to gather as the fruits of their fidelity to their children! There are striking exemplifications of each of these in this memoir. The history of his last ten years is especially touching and instructive. Of a keen sensitiveness to whatever affected his well-being, and of impulsive and ardent affections, his enjoyments and griefs, his hopes and fears, were each in the extreme, and his transitions from the one to the other, as frequent as the changes in the color of the events and the thoughts that threw their lights and shadows over him. While exhibiting to others eminent evidences of piety, he was himself often in doubt. While discharging the duties of his station with distinguished fidelity and success, he was depressed with self-distrust and discouragement at the imperfection of his services; and many of his hours and days were filled with anxieties, sorrow, and tears. We advise our antimillenarian friends, especially, to read this part of the volume, abounding in beautiful and touching lessons, and peculiarly adapted, as the final scene draws on, to excite the sympathies of the Christian heart. If their views of the scheme of God's government over the world are

correct, what reason have they to expect that an hour will ever come in the world's history, when the life of God's children will be any freer from disquiet, darkness, fear, and sorrow than was his; when the earth will not be in essentially the same measure as it now is, a vale of tears; a lazar-house of suffering and death; a vast realm of sepulchres? But how can they reconcile this dark and dreary prospect with the clear and emphatic revelation made in the Scriptures that, at Christ's second coming, the tabernacle of God is to be with men, and he shall dwell with them, and shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and free them from sorrow, suffering, death, and the curse of the fall in all its forms?

11. **THE CHURCH BEFORE THE FLOOD**, by the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. Boston: J. P. Jewett & Co. Cleveland, Ohio: Jewett, Proctor & Worthington. 1854.

THE author treats in this volume, with his usual spirit, of the principal subjects presented in the history of man in the first chapters of Genesis—the creation and fall, the promise of a Saviour, the first martyr, Enoch's prophecy, the flood, and the confusion of tongues at Babel; and with the tact for which he is distinguished, makes them the medium of a great variety of interesting and impressive thoughts on the condition of man, the principles of the divine government, the work of redemption, the characteristics of God's children, and other important themes. It is to be regretted that he gives his assent to the theory of modern geologists respecting the age of the world. He professes the most undoubting conviction that the facts of geology are in perfect consistence with the true meaning of the history of the creation in Genesis; and yet adopts the hypothesis of Chalmers, and others, that immense ages intervened between the creation announced in the first verse Genesis i., and that which is narrated in the remainder of the chapter. He manifestly has not studied the subject, and is not aware that the notion which he embraces is embarrassed by such contradictions to the laws of matter and the facts of geology, as well as the sacred text, as to make it discreditable to men of science to give it their sanction. He takes Hitchcock and Miller as his guides, without having discovered, it would seem, that the suppositions on which they attempt to bring the narrative in Genesis into harmony with their speculations, are wholly dissimilar and destructive of each other.

12. **THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER, THE EPISTLES OF JOHN AND JUDAS, AND THE REVELATION**, translated from the Greek, on the

basis of the Common Version, with Notes. New York: American Bible Union. London: Trubner & Co. 1854.

THE translation of the Epistles named in the title is the same as was noticed in the Journal, April, 1853. The Revelation is now added, and the whole is preceded by an Introduction, in which the general design of the work, and the principles on which the translation is conducted, are stated, and the authorities that have been consulted are given. The text of the common version, the Greek, and the new translation, is given in parallel columns. The notes, occupied chiefly in stating the constructions put on the text by other translators and expositors, but presenting often the reasons of the adoption of the reading that is followed, a critical exposition of terms, and a statement of the considerations that led to the renderings that are given, are the work of great labor, and embody an amount of interesting and important information that insure them a high place in the estimation of critical students of the sacred word.

"This revision," our readers will recollect, is not "final." It is, with the translations of other parts of the sacred text, to be submitted to a board of revisers, by whose adjudication the language finally adopted as the new version is to be determined. Whether adopted absolutely or mainly or not, this will exist as an independent work, and will be an important aid to all who may hereafter attempt a critical exposition of those portions of the New Testament.

13. DAILY BIBLE ILLUSTRATIONS, being Original Readings for a year on subjects from Sacred History, Biography, Geography, Antiquities, and Theology, especially designed for the family circle. By John Kitto, D.D. Evening Series, the Apostles and Early Church. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1854.

THIS volume, which closes the series, is characterized, like its predecessors, by great ease and neatness of style, clearness of delineation, and accuracy and amplitude of information on the topics which it treats; which are the persons, the places, the transactions, and the events, presented in the Acts of the Apostles, in the order in which they occur in the sacred narrative. It is equivalent, therefore, to a history of the ministry of the apostles and the founding of the church as far as they are given in the New Testament, and in a form peculiarly attractive.

14. **SCRIPTURE READINGS.** Sabbath Morning Readings on the Old Testament, by the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. Book of Genesis. Boston: J. P. Jewett & Co. Cleveland, Ohio: Jewett, Proctor & Worthington. 1854.

THESE readings consist of a series of lectures on Genesis, delivered by Dr. Cumming to his congregation, and treating, in a manner adapted to the pulpit, the various themes presented in the sacred history. There are no attempts at minute critical exposition; no intricate discussions; no remote and shadowy speculations, suited to surprise and bewilder, rather than to instruct the reader. The subjects are those presented by the text; he contemplates them in their relation to the great facts of our condition and character, the principles of the divine administration, and the doctrines of redemption; and treats them with an ease, vivacity, and copiousness, that are very pleasing.

15. **SYMBOLIC PROPHECY;** Remarks on an Exposition of the Apocalypse by D. N. Lord, by an Inquirer. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

THE author's object in this pamphlet is to state briefly the views which have been presented by us in the Exposition of the Apocalypse, and in the Journal, of the principles on which prophetic symbols are employed, and the laws by which they are to be interpreted; to exhibit some considerations which show their importance, and confirm their truth; and to urge on the students of the sacred word, the duty of investigating and accepting them as the key which the great Revealer himself has furnished, in the interpretations he has given, of the symbolic Scriptures. The author displays a large knowledge of the subject; he exemplifies the inadequacy of the common method of treating the symbols; he presents a just picture of their peculiar nature, and the certainty that they must be interpreted by laws that have their ground in themselves; and he shows that either the laws we have unfolded must be taken as the guide to their meaning, or they must be considered as inexplicable.

The result to which the discussions on the subject, in the Exposition and Journal, have led the author of this tract—whose name is unknown to us—may be taken as a specimen of the effect that has been wrought on the views of great numbers. Not only has a large body of the most intelligent and evangelical become satisfied of the truth of the laws we have propounded, both of symbols and figures; but no one, we believe, of any consideration in the literary world, can be found, who will seriously controvert them; and the way is



gradually preparing for a freer expression by good men of their impressions on the subject. The hour, indeed, is not remote, we trust, when the sincere students of the Bible, and faithful friends of the truth, will feel it incumbent to make known their dissent from the false and mischievous method of treating the sacred word that has long prevailed in the church, and exert themselves to give currency to the great principles of interpretation which the Scriptures themselves reveal, which have their grounds in the nature of symbols and of language, which are in harmony with the principles of analogy with which we are all familiar, and accord with the laws by which we are all conscious we are accustomed to use simple and tropical speech.

We recommend the perusal of this Essay to our readers, and all others. We wish it may be circulated widely. The price is, we believe, but fifteen cents, for which it can be obtained from any distance by mail.

16. *THE APOCALYPSE UNVEILED.* The Day of Judgment, the Resurrection, and the Millennium, presented in a new light; the repossession of Palestine by the Jews, and their conversion to Christ as their Messiah. Two volumes. New York: E. French. 1853.

THE readers of the above title will misjudge of the character of the work, should they regard the word "unveiled" as used to signify that the Apocalypse is interpreted or attempted to be interpreted in it by the legitimate laws of symbols and language. There is no ground in the volumes for a pretext of the kind. The author has not carried his inquiries so far even as to discover that symbols and figures differ from each other, and that the principles on which they are used, and the rules by which they are to be explained, are essentially unlike. He calls symbols figures and metaphors, and is unaware that there are any authoritative laws of interpretation. His attempts, accordingly, to state the sense of the symbols, are nothing else than mere assertions that certain agents or occurrences are meant by them, or positive expressions of his opinion, without any reasons drawn from the nature of symbols or the principles on which they are employed, for the support of his judgment. His unveiling of the prophecy, consequently, consists, in a large degree, of mere arbitrary and mistaken statements that certain events are foreshown by it; and wild and absurd conjectures, misrepresenting the visions in a very preposterous manner, and degrading them to a level with the dreams of the most lawless fanatics. We might verify this representation by a crowd of examples. We will only cite his construction of the rainbow angel of the tenth chapter:

“And he set his right foot upon the sea, and his left on the earth; and his face was as it were the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire.’ After this description, is it necessary to ask the question, who is this mighty angel? Does not its great voice, its face like the sun, and its feet on fire, proclaim it to be *the present age of steam power and the magnetic telegraph?* Where is the master of the pencil whose unrivalled skill could produce such a picture of the power of steam and the wonders of the telegraph?—*so true in all its lineaments to the original*, and so full of life as this picture is, sketched by the finger of prophecy, near two thousand years before these wonders of art and science had any existence? We all live in the presence of this angel, and, therefore, I said it is as familiar to us as household words. . . . .

“The little book represents a knowledge of the history of steam-power and the electro-magnetic telegraph, with their great and wonderful effects. . . . .

“Roaring as the lion, is expressive of the wonderful effects which will be produced by steam and the magnetic telegraph. A great noise is the common *metaphor* of great changes in the world.

“This loud cry of the angel is represented as being followed by the voice of seven thunders, which will represent the universal acclamation which will express the pleasure and astonishment of the world at the results of these discoveries.”

We wonder the writer did not interpret the seven thunders of the Paixhan guns, great bombs, rockets, and other similar engines of war, that have come into use contemporaneously with steam and the telegraph. That is, undoubtedly, their meaning, if his construction of the angel is right. It does not accord, however, with his representation that “the mission of this angel is not to execute judgment upon men; he brings no implications of divine wrath;” nor does his assumption that he is the symbol of steam power, which is now as important an engine in war as it is in commerce. Had he carried his inquiries into the principles of symbolization far enough to discover its first great law, that agents represent agents, and that living created agents usually stand for men, he would not have fallen into so gross an error as to fancy that a mighty and glorious angel descending from the sky to the earth can be a symbol of the power of steam, or a steam engine, and the magnetic telegraph—two forces or engines that are both unintelligent and wholly unlike each other! A grosser inconsistency with the principles of analogy cannot easily be conceived.

It is to be regretted that the writer has wasted his labor in so wild and lawless a misrepresentation of the prophecy. Had he made himself acquainted with the laws of interpretation, he might,

with due study and caution, have produced a useful work. As it is, it will find few readers, and sink with the crowd written in the same unscientific and haphazard way, into speedy oblivion.

17. HOPE FOR THE JEWS; or, the Jews will be converted to the Christian Faith, and settled and organized as a nation in the land of Palestine. By J. J. Janeway, D.D. New Brunswick, N. J.: J. Terhune & Son. 1853.

THIS volume presents a brief view of the great predictions which occupy a large share of the Old and a portion of the New Testament, of the restoration, conversion, and national re-organization of the Israelites; and a confutation of the false notion lately advanced by Mr. Williamson, that they are no longer the subjects of the covenant with Abraham, nor of any of the promises that were originally made to them. The disbelief by the Protestant church generally of the redemption of the Israelites, according to the prophecies, is one of the events that characterize the age, and bespeaks an astonishing misconception of the laws of language, and the aims of the divine government. We once asked a young gentleman who had just finished his medical education by attending the lectures of several distinguished professors in this city, if he would inform us where the muscles are situated by which breathing is performed. After a pause of a few moments, he answered that he had never heard the subject treated by his instructors, and, indeed, that the question had never presented itself to him. His oversight of so important a part of the human frame was of little significance compared with that of ministers of the sacred word who have never learned that the prophets foreshow, and with a frequency, copiousness, and emphasis that distinguish the theme from others which their revelations respect, that the Israelites are to be recalled from their dispersion, re-established in their ancient land, and re-adopted and honored as God's chosen people. It were not more singular, nor would it indicate a more extraordinary blindness, to overlook the prediction of the resurrection of the dead, or the immortality of the life to which the dead are to be raised. Those who wish a plain, summary, and pointed exhibition of the teachings of the sacred word on the subject, will find it in the statements and reasonings of this volume.

18. ANTIDOTE TO THE POISON OF POPERY, in the Publications of Professor Schaff, first in his Essay, and then in his History. By J. J. Janeway, D.D. New Brunswick, N. J. 1854.

THE object of this pamphlet is to show first, that the theory of de-

velopment advanced by Professor Schaff in his Essay several years since on Protestantism, and the lavish commendations he bestowed in it on the Catholic church of the middle ages, indicate that he was then in fact a philosophic Papist, and that some of the worst features of that apostate power were the objects of his enthusiastic admiration. Next, to confute from the Scriptures the Romish doctrine of the primacy of Peter, and the enormous usurpations and impieties that have been founded on it. And thirdly, to show that though there is a large infusion in his recently translated history of modified and opposite views, Professor Schaff, nevertheless, gives the most unequivocal evidence that he still retains his Romish principles and predilections; that notwithstanding his ostentatious professions and showy flourishes of rhetoric, the theoretic system on which he proceeds will naturally carry those who take him as a guide, into unsophisticated Romanism; and that he must, therefore, be regarded either as unreliable in his protestations against Popery, or else as not understanding himself. That the estimate Dr. Janeway has formed of Professor Schaff as a Papist, as far as he has any religious faith or sentiment, as deceptive, and as resolved at all events, if practicable, to spread his philosophic and historical doctrines here, is correct, we do not doubt. That Prof. Schaff does not comprehend his own principles, no one who has read his work, and is familiar with the theories of his brother Germans, of which they are a mere echo, will for a moment imagine. The system was long since wrought out in all its great features by Schelling, Schleiermacher, Hegel, Neander, and a crowd of others, and is as well understood in all its relations, as any other branch of modern false and dreamy speculation. Professor Schaff has not changed its great outline in any important degree, nor varied its prevailing coloring. He has only altered the grouping of some of the subordinate parts, and given here and there a softer touch to the delineations. To suppose, therefore, that with his principles of philosophy and of development, he can be a sincere Protestant, and believer in the work of redemption, is as impossible as it is to suppose that pitch darkness and dazzling light, to the same eyes, reign at the same time in the same place. In the fancy in which some indulge that Professor Schaff disagrees in any essential particular from Nevin, we have not the slightest faith. Their philosophy is the same; all the Romish doctrines advanced by Nevin are advanced also, or sanctioned by Professor Schaff; and he openly endorses Nevin in his principal writings, and commends him with lavish eulogy. What sort of estimate must be formed of Professor Schaff's principles, if, after all, he disagrees with him in the forms, and in the degrees, in which Protestants disagree with Romanists? The pamphlet is written with spirit and point; is marked by high

moral feelings; and, which is a rare merit, is free from the heartless professions of respect with which many are accustomed to soften and countervail the protestations they utter against false and dangerous teachers. It confutes effectually the doctrine of Peter's primacy, which Professor Schaff sanctions, and points out a series of misstatements, blunders, and inconsistencies, which reveal to the reader the deceptive character of his work, and show with what caution its representations, on the subject of the Papacy especially, are to be received.

19. *THE WORDS OF JESUS*, by the author of the "Morning and Night Watches." New York: Stanford & Swords. 1854.

THIS little volume consists of brief notices of a series of passages taken from the discourses of Christ, and designed to yield the instruction, warning, excitement, and support which the inquiring, the meditative, and the sorrowful often need, amidst the trials of life, and they may be read with benefit and enjoyment by the aged or the young, the sad or the joyous.

20. *THE BRITISH PERIODICALS*. Republished by L. Scott & Co.

THESE Reviews for winter and spring have more than their usual number of articles of talent and interest, especially on the themes that are now attracting the eyes of the whole world,—the revolution in China and the Eastern war, the condition of Russia, the resources of the Turks, the policy of the Western states, and the results in which the contest is possibly to terminate. Among these, that "On the War in the East and its Political Contingencies," in the *North British* for February, is above all entitled to attention, from the intimations it presents of the probability that the struggle is at length to involve the whole of the west of Europe, a union of Austria with Russia, and thence a conflict betwixt despotism and liberty, in which England and France will be obliged to take the side of the people, and patronize and sustain a revolution throughout Germany and Italy. The feeling is universal abroad that the contest is tending to momentous issues, and it deserves to be contemplated by the Christian especially who regards it as probably one of the great steps that are rapidly leading on to the final catastrophe of the antichristian powers, with the profoundest attention. Beside these, there is a large array of articles on other themes of universal interest, from the learning they display, the importance of the principles they advance, and the vivid pictures they present of the characteristics of the age, or the great parties in politics and religion that are endeavoring to animate it with their spirit, and give it the impress of their peculiar features.

T H E  
THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY  
J O U R N A L.

---

VOLUME VII.

OCTOBER, 1854.

NUMBER II.

---

ART. I.—THE TRUTH OF THE LAWS OF SYMBOLIZATION,  
AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THE RESULTS TO WHICH THEY  
LEAD.

BY THE EDITOR.

OF the objects and character of the work,\* the title of which is given at the foot of the page, on the views of the principles of symbolization that have been propounded in the Journal, we have already apprised our readers. It is the result of careful study, is marked by sound sense and good taste, exhibits a knowledge of the subject far greater than is found in the essays of our opponents, and is entitled to the respectful consideration of all, whether millenarians or antimillenarians, who desire to understand the great teachings of the prophetic Scriptures.

We design in the present article to point out somewhat more fully than we have heretofore done, the principle on which symbols are employed, in contradistinction from

---

\* *The Premium Essay on the Characteristics and Laws of Prophetic Symbols*, by the Rev. Edward Winthrop, A. M. New York: F. Knight. 1854.

figures; and to exemplify more at large the important results in interpretation to which their laws lead.

The question whether those laws are true or not, is nothing less, it should be considered, than the question whether or not there are any laws of symbolization; that is, whether the symbols of the prophets are employed on any settled and natural principle that can be clearly defined, verified, and used as a key to their meaning; or whether they must be regarded as wholly inexplicable. This is seen from the fact that those who are unacquainted with their laws, or do not adopt them, have, as is well known, no settled rules for the exposition of the symbols. Such writers, for example, as Mr. Barnes, the author of the "*Apocalypse Unveiled*," and Professor Stuart, do not pretend to be guided in their interpretations by any specific and fixed rules. Not the semblance of any thing like a law of symbolization is presented on their pages; and their constructions show that they had no clearly defined and settled principle of interpretation. They are altogether conjectural and haphazard, now proceeding tacitly on one theory, and now on another, and alike at war with the nature of the symbols, and inconsistent with one another. This is true also of the leading writers in Europe, whether antimillenarians or millenarians;—Hengstenberg, Brown, and Faber, on the one side; and Elliott, Keith, Brooks, Bonar, and Cuninghame on the other. It is a remarkable fact, that notwithstanding the vast series of volumes that have been written on the subject, and by men of ability and learning, no statement is to be found in any of their works of any law by which a single symbol of the prophets can be interpreted. They have accumulated a vast amount of important information, especially in their historical inquiries. They have cleared up many difficult points with great learning and skill; they have set forth many truths with much force and beauty; they have framed many of their conjectures with great tact, and have hit adroitly in a share of their guesses; yet nevertheless, their interpretations of the symbols have been the work of vague impression, conjecture, or assumption; not the result of a clear, authentic, and demonstrable principle. And that must continue to be the character of this branch of interpretation, unless the laws we have propounded are true, and are taken as such;.

inasmuch as, if the symbols are not employed on the principle of these laws, they cannot be employed on any principle whatever—there being none, as will hereafter be shown, besides that of a general correspondence of the symbol and that which is symbolized, on which the one can be used as the representative of the other.

But no one will venture to maintain that the symbols are not used on any settled and intelligible principle; that they are a mere series of pictures or spectres that have no common relation to that which they portend—no intrinsic adaptation; any more than any other objects drawn from the natural world or from fancy, to represent what they are employed to foreshow. That were to deny that they are the medium of a prophecy. They plainly cannot be the instrument of prediction, if there is no tie by which that which is foreshown, is connected with that which is employed to foreshow it. They cannot be interpreted as denoting certain agents and events, unless there is some principle by which it can be deduced from their nature, that they are the representatives of such agents and events. It is to impeach the wisdom and truth of God also, and exhibit him as trifling with his creatures, and imposing on them a deceptive and unmeaning pageant under the pretext of a revelation, the knowledge of which is of the utmost moment to their well-being. All who regard the symbolic Scriptures as a revelation from him, will admit that their symbols are suitable means to the end for which they are employed; and therefore that they are used on some natural, settled, and intelligible principle, which must be understood in order to discern their meaning, and is the key by which they are to be interpreted.

But the fact that they are the medium of a revelation, and thence are used on some natural, uniform, and intelligible principle, makes it equally certain that that principle is either analogy or an exact likeness; that is, a general correspondence in nature, agency, conditions, and effects, between the prophetic representative and that which it represents, in contradistinction from a mere resemblance in some single particular; inasmuch as there is no other principle on which the symbols can be a natural, clear, and demonstrable representative of a specific class of agents,



agencies, and effects, in distinction from others. An analogy or general correspondence between one thing and another, is not constituted by a likeness in a single particular, but involves a general resemblance. In order to an analogy betwixt a symbol and that which it symbolizes, the symbol must be, in its own peculiar sphere, what that which it is employed to represent is in the sphere to which it belongs. If the one is an agent, the other must be. If the one exerts acts, the other must exert acts also. If the one is the object of actions from a different agent, the other must also be the object of a similar agency from a different agent. If the one produces effects, the other must produce effects also. Otherwise there would be no means of determining what the thing is which the symbol is used to represent. A likeness in a single particular, is no adequate means of representing a specific class of agents or effects, and proving that they—in contradistinction from all others—are the agents or effects that are represented. Resemblances, in some single particular, subsist between thousands of things that, nevertheless, bear no such general likeness that the one can be used as the symbol of the other. There is, for example, an infinite multitude of things that resemble each other in slighness of substance, in giving pleasure or pain, in worthlessness, and innumerable other peculiarities, that yet have no adaptation whatever to represent each other. They are often, in the main, the widest possible opposites. They often present in all points, except the one of likeness, the utmost dissimilarity; they form the boldest contrasts. Were, therefore, an object used as a representative, on the mere ground of a resemblance in some single and unspecified particular, it would be wholly impossible to tell what one out of thousands and myriads of things which it resembles in some one respect, is the thing it was employed to represent. Interpretation could, at the best, be nothing but conjecture; and the conjecture that any individual thing is the object represented, could have no greater probability than that any other out of myriads is that object. Mere likeness, therefore, in a single particular cannot be the ground on which the symbols of the prophets are employed. No principle can connect the symbol with that which it symbolizes with such clearness and certainty as to furnish a key to the signification,

and enable the student to deduce the one from the other, except that either of analogy, that is, a general correspondence of the one with the other in nature, relations, agency, and effects; or else an exact likeness of nature, agency, and effects. The symbol must be, in its peculiar station, acts, and effects, the counterpart of that which it symbolizes. It must be in its own sphere, what that which it symbolizes is in the sphere to which that belongs; and accordingly, that which is symbolized must be in its proper place what the representative is in its proper place; so that the nature, office, agency, and effects of the one can be deduced from those of the other.

It is clear then that symbols, in order to fill the office for which they are used, and furnish a natural and infallible clue to that which they represent, must be employed on the principle, either of analogy, *i. e.* a correspondence in all their main features and characteristics to that which they symbolize; or else of an exact likeness, as when men represent men, and a resurrection symbolizes a resurrection. And this great truth it is of the utmost moment to understand; as it is from the non-perception or neglect of it—as we shall hereafter show—that expositors have run into a large part of their errors.

The fact that symbols are thus employed on the principle either of a general resemblance or an exact likeness, makes certain therefore the truth of the great laws: 1st. That the symbol, and that which it represents, resemble each other in the station they fill, the relations they sustain, and the agencies they exert in their respective spheres. 2d. That agents, therefore, represent agents, and living agents living agents; that acts symbolize acts, and that effects stand for effects, and conditions for conditions; for this is in accordance with analogy; as no analogy subsists between different agents or objects, except where there is such a correspondence of station, agency, and effects. 3d. It verifies the law also, that where a symbol is used in the relation of analogy, the representative and that which it represents are of different species, kinds, or rank; as it is only between things that are not the same in kind or rank, that analogy can exist. Things that are of identically the same kind have an exact likeness, not simply a general correspondence, that admits, neverthe-

less, of a diversity of nature, agency, and effect. Thus, for example, wild beasts that prey on inferior animals, present a general resemblance to ferocious and bloody rulers who slaughter their fellow men ; and they are used as their representatives on the principle of analogy. But men, when flying in terror from the presence of the Lamb descending to judge them, and when raised from the grave, and arraigned and sentenced to eternal death, are used as symbols on the principle of exact likeness ; because on the one hand there are no beings whom they can represent on the principle of analogy, as men alone are to be the subjects of those great events ; and on the other, because there are no beings but men themselves in those identical conditions, who can properly represent them as in them, and as the subjects of those feelings, actions, and effects which they are to occasion. Animals could not ; they pass through no such states ; they are not the subjects of any acts that bear a resemblance to those judicial processes. Inanimate objects, for a similar reason, could not ; nor could angels. Angels do not fear a corporeal death. They are not to be raised from the dead. As then there is no agent or object in the universe that, on the ground of analogy, could serve as the symbol of men at those peculiar crises of their being ; it is as certain that when such events are to be foreshown, symbols are used on the principle of exact likeness or sameness of agents and events, as it is in all other cases that they are employed on the principle of analogy.

These great laws of symbolization, thus deduced from the nature of the office which they fill, are accordingly indicated and exemplified in the symbolic prophecies themselves, in the interpretations that are given by the Spirit of a large number of the symbols. Thus the lion with wings, the bear, the winged leopard, and the beast with ten horns, Dan. vii., are interpreted by the Spirit as symbolizing the dynasties of Babylonia, Media and Persia, Greece and Rome, or the organized bodies of rulers with a chief at their head, that exercised the governments of those empires ; and the acts of the beasts in the vision, the changes through which they passed, and the effects they produced, are explained as symbolizing corresponding acts the rulers they respectively represented were to exercise in their sphere, the changes through which

they were to pass, and the effects to which they were to give birth. In like manner the ram and the goat, Daniel viii., are interpreted as symbolizing the dynasties or organized bodies of rulers with a monarch at their head, of Media and Greece, and their acts, effects, and catastrophes, as representing analogous acts, effects, and catastrophes of the dynasties of which they were the symbols. And a similar construction is given of every other symbolic agent that is interpreted by the revealing Spirit; and as it is in accordance with the nature of the representatives, as it is demanded by analogy, as any other construction would be against nature, incongruous, and make the relation of the symbol to that which it represents, uncertain and reasonless, and deprive interpretation of all specific rule, it must be taken as indicating a fundamental principle of symbolization, and revealing a positive and invariable law. To suppose that there is nothing in the nature and relation of an agent that makes it a fit representative alone of agents; to assume that the agent may as well represent an act, an effect, or a condition; and that either of the latter may as well be taken as the thing denoted by the symbol, as the former, is absurd, and would render the meaning of the symbol indeterminable; as no one could then tell whether that which the symbol denoted was a body of conscious intelligent agents, a set of actions exerted by such agents, a class of effects produced by them in a different species of existences, or a mere set of conditions of dependence, subordination, exposure to good or evil influences, or some other kind of effect emanating from the symbol.

But the Divine Spirit, in giving the interpretations which establish this great law, makes a further revelation that is of almost equal importance as a guide to interpretation, in showing, first, that the symbol, and that which it symbolizes, are in such cases of different spheres; and next, in indicating what sphere in the world of men, is the correlate of the sphere of the unintelligent world from which those interpreted symbols are taken. In these instances the unintelligent natural world is taken as answering in symbolization to the world of men in their social and political organizations, or existing as communities and nations. As powerful and ferocious beasts that prey on creatures of inferior strength, are employed as representatives of powerful,

bloody, and destroying rulers in the world of men, the natural, unintelligent world from which the symbols are drawn, is taken as answering to the world of men which they are employed to symbolize. These two great spheres, therefore, are, in this species of prophecy, the counterparts of each other; and, consequently, when a symbol is taken from the one, it is from that consideration certain that it is the representative of an analogous agent, act, or event, in the other.

This is confirmed, accordingly, by the fact that all the symbols taken from the sphere of unintelligent nature that are interpreted by the Spirit, are interpreted as the symbols of men in their relations as rulers or subjects. Thus the great tree of Dan. iv. is interpreted as symbolizing Nebuchadnezzar, the monarch of Babylon; the two olive trees (Zech. iv. 11-14), as standing for anointed ones or priests; the waters (Rev. xvii. 15), as denoting peoples, and multitudes, and nations; the hosts, *i. e.* the orbs of heaven (Dan. viii.), as symbols of God's people; the sun, moon, and stars (Genesis xxxvii.) as representatives of Joseph's father, mother, and brothers; mountains are exhibited (Rev. xvii. 9, 10) as symbols of dynasties, or combinations of rulers; and the whole carth (Rev. xiii. 3, xix. 2) as the symbol of its human population. These symbols, taken from the principal departments of nature—the earth, the mountains, the waters, trees, animals, and the heavenly orbs, are thus explained as representatives of men. They show, accordingly, that the sphere of unintelligent nature answers in symbolization to the sphere of the intelligent world of men, and establish it, therefore, as a law, that when an uninterpreted symbol is taken from the one sphere, it is, from that consideration, to be held that that which it symbolizes is of the correlative sphere of men. This is a principle, then, of the utmost moment, and serves as a key to a large body of the most important uninterpreted symbols. Thus, it shows that the seas, out of which the wild beasts of Daniel's vision, and the ten-horned beast of the Apocalypse, emerged, are symbols of the peoples, multitudes, and tongues, that became the subjects over which the dynasties those beasts represent reigned. It shows that the sea, and the rivers and fountains into which the second and third vials were dashed, and the Euphrates, on which the

sixth was poured, are symbols of communities, multitudes, and nations of men.

It shows that, where one department of nature is exhibited as exerting a fatal agency on another department, it indicates that one organized body or nation of men are to exert a corresponding agency of injury and destruction on another division or nation. The bloody and fiery tempest, therefore, under the first trumpet, by which all the grass and one-third of the trees were destroyed, denotes that an invading warlike host was to overrun and ravage the Roman western empire, and waste it with carnage and devastation. The precipitation of a burning mountain into the sea, and destruction of a third of the ships and the fish, under the second trumpet, represents the incursion into the empire of a resistless body of conquerors, who should inflict a resembling destruction on the inhabitants and their property. The infusion of a deadly bitterness into the streams and fountains, under the third trumpet, symbolizes the infusion of a temper or spirit into the nations whom they represent, by which they should prove destructive to the nations that should attempt to conquer them. The smiting of the sun, moon, and stars, under the fourth trumpet, by which they became in part dark, signifies that a fatal blow was to be inflicted on the rulers of the empire, by which a part of them were to be divested of their political power, and cease to act in their office as rulers. The earthquake under the seventh vial symbolizes a great political convulsion of the nations inhabiting the portion of the earth which was the subject of the earthquake; and the earthquake under the sixth seal, the darkening of the sun and moon, the fall of the stars, the passing away of the heavens, and the removal of the mountains and islands, indicates a general convulsion of the nations, the overthrow of their governments, and the breaking up of their political organizations throughout the world; and so of other similar symbols under the vials. This principle is thus as indubitable, and presents as certain and imperative a rule of interpretation, as the great law that agents symbolize agents, acts represent acts, and effects stand for effects.

We have, then, three great characteristics established by these interpretations. 1st. That the symbol and that which

it represents, are the counterpart of each other, or have a general correspondence in office, agency, and effects : agents standing for agents, acts for acts, effects for effects, and conditions for conditions. 2d. That symbols taken from certain spheres have their counterpart in agents or objects of a different sphere. 3d. That when an uninterpreted symbol is taken from a class that has its correlative in a different sphere, that fact is a proof that that which it represents belongs to that correlative sphere, not to its own. These characteristics or laws will be found to hold equally of several other orders of symbols.

Though a large share of the symbols are taken from the unintelligent world, there are many that are drawn from other realms of existence. Of these, a very important class are men themselves of the very ranks—rulers, warriors, oppressors, and slaughterers,—whom the preceding orders taken from the material and animal world, are employed to symbolize. Thus, the symbols of the first, second, third, and fourth seals, are warriors, bloody usurpers, oppressors, and slaughterers; the heads of armies, and organized bodies of rulers who employ themselves in conquests, insurrections, and attempts by violence and bloodshed to seize supreme power; oppressors, and cruel, savage, and wanton destroyers of their fellow-men. As these are agents, and exert acts and produce effects of a momentous character, those whom they represent are also agents, and agents who exert acts and produce effects of equal moment in the sphere to which they belong. What, then, is that sphere? Are the agents and acts symbolized of the same order as the symbols themselves are, or are they of a different class? Though no interpretations are given of them, as there are of the beasts of Daniel's visions, there are ample evidences that the agents and acts which they represent are of a different sphere from themselves.

This is indicated, first, by the fact that there is an order of men of a different sphere from that of military conquerors, oppressors, and slaughterers, who present an obvious and striking parallel to them in their office, and their agency on others, and whom, therefore, they naturally and properly symbolize. Such are the ministers of the Christian church. The church is a different organized body or community

from the civil or political community. Its ministers are rulers over it, and exert influences on it and on others, analogous to those which successful warriors, conspirators against the established government, aspirants after supreme power, oppressors, and wanton and merciless destroyers exert on their subjects and fellow-men. Faithful ministers win souls to Christ, and extend the limits of his kingdom over nations and tribes that had been aliens from him. Ambitious ministers disturb the church by dissensions and unwarrantable assumptions of power. Perverters of religion lead their people to false notions of the nature of piety, and starve them by withholding from them the truth, and pointing them to false methods of attaining sanctification and peace. Apostate teachers substitute a false and destructive religion in place of the true, and destroy the souls of their hearers by prompting them to superstition, idolatry, and the homage of imaginary mediators and saviours. They fill an office, therefore, that in their sphere answers to that of warriors, like the symbols in theirs; and they exert a deadly influence on the souls of men, that resembles the destructive agency of the symbols on their bodies. The fact accordingly, that there is a sphere that presents the requisite correlation to that of the symbols, is a proof that the agents and acts symbolized, belong to that correlative sphere. Otherwise, there could be no certainty from the principle of symbolization, that the agent and event symbolized, belonged to a different realm from its own. If a symbol may, in identically the same instance, represent an agent precisely like itself, as well as an agent of another and analogous sphere, then there can be no criterion by which it can be known whether the representative agent is used on the principle of analogy, or the principle of exact likeness. The fact that there is a sphere that presents the requisite correlation to that from which the symbol is drawn, must be taken as itself a conclusive proof, therefore, that the agents and events represented belong to that correlated sphere.

It is indicated, next, by the fact that the symbol of the fourth seal, death riding a pale horse, killing with the sword, famine, pestilence, and wild beasts, and followed by the grave, is not taken from the sphere of nature, but is a monster—a mere visionary existence, and cannot; there-



fore, be used as a representative of agents of its own kind. It must, of necessity, like the seven-headed beast, the winged leopard and winged lion, the locusts, and other monster symbols, be used as the representative of an order of agents differing from itself, and real men acting in a natural sphere, and producing effects that resemble those of the symbol in destructiveness; and such are apostate ministers of the church, who destroy the souls of men, and plunge them into the abyss of the second death by false teaching, oppression, and tyranny.

It is indicated, thirdly, by the fact that the ministers of the apostate church are exhibited in other parts of the prophecy as the corrupters of men, and as involving all whom she entices to her service, in eternal destruction. Thus, she is denominated the great harlot that corrupted the earth with her fornication, that caused all the nations to drink of her infuriating wine, and that seduced the kings of the earth; and all that drank her wine are represented as consigned to the tortures of the lake of fire and brimstone (Rev. xix. 2, xviii. 3, and xiv. 8-11). That Babylon is the symbol of human agents, is shown by the fact that a woman is repeatedly used as the symbol that bears that name, as well as the city on the Euphrates, of which it is the proper denominative. And that it is the symbol of the ministers of the apostate church, is shown by the acts which she exerts—ruling, seducing, giving intoxicating and maddening wine to the nations, and causing that as many as would not worship the image of the beast—that is, as would not yield her the homage which she demands (Rev. xiii. 15-17)—should be put to death. The first of these, which are symbolic acts, on the principle of analogy, are representative of precisely the agency the apostate Roman church has exerted towards the nations and monarchs; and the last, which is used on the principle of likeness, is exactly the agency she has literally exercised towards those who have refused obedience to her imperious will. As the ministers of a part of the church have thus pursued the identical course which corresponds to the symbolic acts of the second, third, and fourth of these symbols, it must be held to be certain that they are the agents whom the symbols represent.

And finally, it is indicated by the fact that the souls that

appeared under the fifth seal, were the souls of those who had been martyred for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus. The agents that put them to death were the destroyers, doubtless, symbolized under the preceding seals; no others had been mentioned. The destructive agents, therefore, represented under those seals, are the ministers of the church; for the ministers of the church have been the prompters and chief agents in all the persecutions of the true worshippers, from the days of Constantine to the present time. The civil rulers have been the mere instruments and executors of the will of the persecuting ecclesiastics.

We have the most ample certainty, then, from these considerations, that the counterpart in the prophecy, of the military, is the Christian world, and that the conquerors, slaughterers, oppressors, and destroyers of these seals, taken from the one, are symbols of the teachers and rulers of the church who hold analogous stations, are animated by a resembling spirit of ambition, tyranny, and malevolence, and exert a deadly agency on the souls of men, that is parallel to that destruction which the symbols inflicted on their bodies. These symbols are employed, therefore, on the same principles, and are to be interpreted by the same laws, as those that are taken from the unintelligent world. And all other symbols taken from the same sphere, must be regarded as used in the same relation.

Another important class of symbols consists of artificial objects, such as an image, cities, a temple, candlesticks, a sword, fine linen, white robes—fabrics that are formed by human or divine agency, by the union and arrangement of the materials of which they are built, in modes in which they did not originally exist. What, now, is the sphere to which we are to look for the counterparts of these symbols? Do they represent things of the same classes as themselves, or of a different order? We answer: They are not all used in the same relation. Some of them are symbols of men of an analogous character, and united in resembling artificial organizations; others are symbols of something that belongs to men as an instrument or characteristic, while in a single instance a city and the temple are used in a still different relation. Thus, the great image of four metals (Dan. ii.) is the symbol, it is shown by the interpretation given of it in

the prophecy, of the series of monarchs and subordinate rulers of the four great empires of Babylon, Media and Persia, Greece, and Rome; and there is an analogy between such an image considered as a deity exercising a decisive sway over the world, and that series of conquering and despotic rulers who have governed the principal nations of the world with resistless power through a long tract of centuries. Babylon, on the Euphrates, a material city of commerce, wealth, luxury, and pleasure, and the capital of a great empire, is the symbol of the hierarchies of the apostate church who are to the populations over whom they rule, what that material city was to the population that inhabited and frequented it. That Babylon is the symbol of human beings, and of a hierarchy of the church, is shown, as already stated, by the fact that a dissolute woman is used to represent identically the same combination of ecclesiastics, and is exhibited as stained with the blood of prophets and saints (chap. xviii. 24), and as causing all to be put to death who refused to pay her the religious homage which she claims.

The new Jerusalem descending from heaven, built of precious stones, paved with gold, watered with a river flowing from the throne of God, with trees of life set on its banks, and lighted by the glory of God and the Lamb, is the symbol, it is expressly shown by the interpreting angel, of the Lamb's wife, the risen and glorified saints in their organization as priests unto God, and kings, who are to reign with Christ on the earth, and judge and rule the nations. And there is a beautiful analogy between such a glorious structure descending from heaven, the scene of God's visible manifestation of himself, the residence of holy and happy beings redeemed from the dominion and curse of sin, and given to eat of the tree of immortal life; and the glorified saints in their relations as rulers and priests to the sanctified and happy nations who are to live beneath their benignant rule. Candlesticks or lampstands that support a candle or lamp, are expressly interpreted, also, as symbols of churches that sustain a minister of the gospel in his office as teacher; and there is an obvious and beautiful analogy between a lampstand upholding a lamp in an apartment, in which a family or congregation are assembled, in a proper position for the diffusion of the light throughout the

scene, that all may enjoy its aid, and a congregation of Christian believers uniting in the support of a faithful teacher of the sacred word in his office, in such a manner as to enable him advantageously to discharge its duties.

The city Jerusalem, however, instead of being used as a symbol of a combination of men, is taken as the scene of a civil government and a large population, where the temple was stationed, and employed as a representative of the analogous places in the empires or dominions of Christendom in which the Christian church exists: while the temple itself, situated in Jerusalem, under that civil polity, in which the worship of God was offered, is used as the symbol of the structures in the Gentile nations, in which Christian worshippers assemble to offer homage; and it is in each instance the most natural relation for the use of the symbol. There is an obvious analogy between Jerusalem as the scene of a civil government under whose jurisdiction the worshippers at the temple lived; and the great capitals and other centres of population in the Gentile empires, where the Christian worshippers who assemble in their religious edifices for the homage of God, live. In like manner the temple at Jerusalem was, as a structure, to Hebrew worshippers, what the religious edifices of the Christian church are to those who worship in them. And each presents to the correlative it is thus used to represent, a more striking correspondence than to anything else.

But it will, perhaps, be asked, if Babylon is used as a symbol of men united in a compact organization, and if the new Jerusalem is employed as the representative of men also raised from the dead, and organized as a body of kings and priests; why are not the old Jerusalem and its material temple employed also as symbols of men in some corresponding organization? If the former symbolize men as agents, why does not that fact make it necessary to regard the latter also as representatives of agents? The answer is, These symbolic cities, not being themselves agents, need not of necessity symbolize agents. Were they agents, like the beasts of Daniel's vision, the fiery tempest, the volcanic mountain, the falling star of the trumpets, and the horsemen of the seals of the Apocalypse, they then would, by the first great law of analogy, have been used as representatives of agents.

But as they are not agents, but are material and fixed structures formed by art, they must be used on the ground of a different analogy, and may denote men who are agents, or places and structures in other scenes to which they present an obvious resemblance. The literal Jerusalem, and the temple there, are used on the ground of analogy, as clearly as Babylon and the new Jerusalem are; and the reason that they are employed as the symbols, the one of places and the other of religious structures, is that they bear an obvious and striking analogy to them.

The sword proceeding from Christ's mouth is a symbol of the dissolving breath, 2 Thess. ii. 8, with which he is to destroy the man of sin, and the armies of the kings at Armageddon, Rev. xix. 21,—an instrument of death of one kind, being employed as the symbol of another.

Fine linen pure and white, enrobing the body, is used on the ground of analogy, as a symbol of the soul's legal purity and justification with God.

Symbols of this class then, though not themselves agents, and not subject, therefore, to the first great law that agents represent agents, are yet used on the ground of analogy, and are to be interpreted by the law that the symbol is of a different sphere from that which it symbolizes; and that that which is symbolized is in the sphere to which it belongs, what the symbol that represents it is in the sphere to which that belongs.

Another important class of symbols are the inhabitants of the angelic world, who are exhibited as descending to the atmosphere of the earth, and exerting actions appropriate to their nature. Thus, Rev. xii. 7—12, Michael and his angels are exhibited as warring in the atmosphere with the devil and his angels, and as driving the latter out of the sky, and casting them to the earth. And they are employed as symbols of analogous classes of men; the former of the faithful ministers of the Christian religion in their contest with the ministers of the pagan religion, whom Satan and his legions represent. That they denote men, and the good angels the ministers and confessors of the Christian church, is seen from the song of exultation that followed their triumph over the devil and his angels. A voice was heard from heaven, that is from the victorious angels under Mi-

chael, saying, "now is our salvation and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Messiah; for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before God day and night; and *they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto death.*" Michael and his angels, therefore, represented the teachers, confessors, and martyrs of the Christian church; and Satan and his angels represented the corresponding teachers and active supporters of the antagonistic Pagan religion. And they present a striking analogy to the classes which they symbolize. Good angels are to evil angels contending for the possession of the atmosphere of our world, what the teachers and confessors of the Christian religion were to the priests and leaders of the Pagan religion, who opposed and persecuted them in their struggle for supremacy in the Roman empire. Both were agents, and represented agents. The good angels used means to conquer Satan and his party, that were suited to their office and the end at which they aimed. The means also used by the Christian party on earth, whom they symbolized, were suited to their office and profession. The blood of the Lamb, and the word of the testimony they were commissioned to utter, and the effects of their victory, were appropriate to their office and agency—salvation and strength, and the supremacy of the Christian population. The struggle and fall of the devil and his party, and their rage at their defeat, answered also to the struggle, the defeat, and the chagrin and rage of the Pagan party, whom they represented. In this instance, then, all the great laws we have stated are exemplified. The symbols are agents, and represent agents. They are used on the principle of analogy, and are of a different order and sphere, therefore, from the agents whom they represent; and the acts of the symbols and effects they produced, denote corresponding acts of those whom they represent, and effects to which they gave birth.

This then must be taken as the law of symbols of this class, when the agency ascribed to them is such that it may have a counterpart in the actions of men. And such is the angel, Rev. x. 1-3, descending from heaven, crying with a loud voice, and lifting his hand to heaven, and swearing that the time of the establishment of Christ's kingdom had

not yet come, but that the mystery should be finished in the days of the seventh trumpet; for he obviously addressed his cry and his oath to men, and in the latter, interpreted the revelation made in the prophecy respecting the time of Christ's kingdom to which the voices of the seven thunders in answer to his cry had referred; and his acts are acts that are appropriate to men. As then he undoubtedly addressed men, for there are no other intelligences in our world whom he can be supposed to have addressed; and as no such literal angel has descended from heaven, and uttered such a cry and oath to the nations, he must of necessity be held to be the symbol of men; and men who are in their sphere what he was in his. As his message was addressed to men, so were theirs. As his utterances produced great commotion and excited a thunder response from the nations whom he addressed, so must theirs. As that response led him to indicate that the period of the great events they anticipated was not to come till the time of the seventh trumpet, so must they have made a similar proclamation. And as he gave the little book held in his hand, to the prophet, so must they have given a volume also to those whom they addressed; and this had its fulfilment in the agency of the Reformers in the sixteenth century in addressing the nations, and the excitement their teachings produced; in the controversies that rose respecting the time of the overthrow of antichrist and the establishment of Christ's kingdom on the earth; and in the translation and free circulation, by them, of the Scriptures. The exact correspondence, in all its features, of the part they acted and the effects they produced, to the agency of the angel, and the effects to which he gave birth, presents the most abundant certainty that they are the agents whom he represents.

In like manner the angels, chap. xiv., who fly through mid-heaven and make announcements, must be taken as symbols of men. First, because their messages were plainly to be addressed to men. Why did they descend to the atmosphere, and fly through it while making their announcements, if they were not addressed to men? If designed for other orders of beings, why were they not uttered in the worlds in which those beings reside? There are no other intelligences in our world to whom they can be

supposed to be addressed. But their messages themselves show that they are to be addressed to men. The first has "the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people;" and he exhorts them "to fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment has come; and to worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." The second also is, undoubtedly, to be addressed to men, as his announcement is, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." And the third, also, is certainly to be addressed to them: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation." And it is added, "Here is the patience of the saints, here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." As they all three address their announcements to men, and as angels perform no such office towards men under the present dispensation, it is certain that they symbolize men, who are to act a part in the church that is to correspond in conspicuity and significance to theirs, in proclaiming the gospel and the arrival of the hour of God's judgment, the fall of Babylon, and the doom that awaits those who continue the worship of the beast or its image.

The angel descending from heaven, chap. xviii., is probably the same as that, chap. xiv. 8, announcing the fall of Babylon.

The four angels at the four corners of the earth holding the winds, and the angel ascending from the sun-rising having the seal of God, chap. vii. 1-3, are symbols also of men. This is seen, not only from the consideration that angels do not interpose visibly to control the winds, or for other purposes under the present dispensation, but from the fact that the office of the angel from the sun-rising directly respects men. He is to seal the servants of God on their foreheads. He unquestionably then represents a body of men who are to perform the work that sealing denotes. The angels of the winds, therefore, whom he addresses, and who are to postpone their work of rousing the tempests that are to spread devastation over the land and the sea, till he has



accomplished the sealing of God's servants, also symbolize men, who are to arouse the political tornado which the tempest blasts of the atmosphere represent.

All these are thus clearly used on the principle of analogy; the symbol being of a different sphere from that which it symbolizes, agents denoting agents, and the acts and effects of the one corresponding to the acts and effects of the other.

All the classes of symbols we have thus far considered, are used on the principle of analogy, the agents and things represented being of different spheres from the symbols by which they are represented. There are several classes, however, and many individual symbols that are employed, not on the principle of analogy, as representatives of a different order of agents or things, but as representatives of themselves, or agents and things of their own kind.

Of these, the first and most important are, the Divine Persons who appear in the vision,—the Father and the Son; as in Daniel's vision of the judgment of the beast and the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds; and John's vision, Rev. iv. & v., of the Father enthroned and receiving the adoration of the living creatures and elders; and of the Lamb taking the book from the hand of the Father, and receiving the homage of the living creatures, elders, and angels; and in several other visions. That they cannot have appeared as symbols of other orders of beings, is certain from the consideration that there are no creatures who bear to them such an analogy of nature, station, prerogatives, relations, and actions, that they can be represented by them. There are no creatures who are in their sphere what God the Father and the Lamb are in theirs. It is impossible, therefore, from the total want of the requisite correspondence in creatures that those divine symbols can have appeared in the visions as representatives of creatures. They must have appeared as representatives of themselves, therefore; and the reason was, that no created agent could properly represent them. It was as inconsistent with their nature and office, that creatures should represent them, as it was that they should act as representatives of creatures. In order that it might be seen that the revelation proceeded from them, it was necessary that they should appear in person in the visions, and make

it; and in order that it might be foreshown that they are to appear in person at the destruction of antichrist, the resurrection of the holy dead, and the descent of the New Jerusalem, and during the reign of the thousand years, it was necessary that they should appear in the visions in which their personal and visible presence is foreshown at those epochs.

This is equally certain, also, from the mode of their appearance, and the acts which they exerted in the visions, such as the ineffable glory with which they were invested, the insignia of deity which they bore, their attendance by innumerable hosts of angels, their reception of homage from all orders of holy beings, the judgment of the beast, the investiture of the Son of Man with the dominion of the earth, his making the revelation of the Apocalypse, his descending from heaven attended by the armies of the redeemed, and destruction of the wild beast, false prophet, and their armies, and his reigning with the Father on the throne of the New Jerusalem. They are conditions and acts that are peculiar to God the Father, and the Son: They have no counterpart in the stations and acts of men, or any other order of creatures. And finally, this is confirmed by the express announcement (Rev. v. 2-5) that no creature was found capable of serving as a symbol of Christ in his office and work as the Lamb. To assume that it can be otherwise, is to offer the grossest contradiction to the divine attributes and prerogatives. To suppose God the Father, or the Son, is the symbol in any of their appearances of creatures, were to convert the visions into an infinite solecism, and make their explication impossible.

We have thus the clearest certainty that these divine persons appear and act as representatives of themselves, not as symbols of other orders of beings; and that it arises, on the one hand, from the impossibility of finding any symbol of a different order that could represent them; and on the other, from the impossibility from their nature, that they should serve as the representatives of creatures.

Another class of symbols that are used in this relation, are the souls of the dead: such as the living creatures and elders of the vision (Rev. iv. and v.) and the souls of the dead under the fifth seal (Rev. vi. 9, 10), and in the vision of the first resurrection (Rev. xx. 4-6). That the living crea-

tures and elders are themselves human spirits, is seen from the fact that they make their redemption by the blood of the Lamb, the theme of their song; and that they symbolize the souls of the redeemed, universally, who had then passed into the intermediate life, is seen from their representing that though they were but twenty-eight in number, yet the Lamb had redeemed them out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. They are symbols, therefore, of all who had then been redeemed; and they are symbols exclusively of men, inasmuch as no beings but those of our race are redeemed by the blood of the Lamb. That they are symbols of redeemed spirits of men, is seen also from their being made unto God kings and priests, and from their future reign on the earth; as they are the prerogatives of the saints who are to be raised in glory at the first resurrection (Rev. xx. 4-6). And as they cannot be representatives of any other order of beings, so they appear in their own persons in the visions, because no other order of beings could represent them. No others have passed through such a change, exist in such a relation to God, or are destined to such an existence and such stations hereafter. The souls of the dead, under the fifth seal, and in the vision of the first resurrection (Rev. vi. 9-11 and xx. 4-6), are used also in the same relation. As they are conscious agents, they must represent intelligent agents. But they cannot represent agents of a different order from themselves, manifestly, from the fact that there is no other class to whom they present an analogy. There is no other order of spirits who have been disembodied by death, and some of them by martyrdom as the witnesses of Jesus. They cannot be the symbols of men in the body, as they present the greatest possible dissimilarity to men in the natural life, instead of an analogy to them. Men in the natural life have not been put to death. They are not disembodied; they are not in the state intermediate between death and the resurrection; they are not in a condition to receive white robes—the symbol of justification—and to enter into rest. They are used, therefore, as symbols of the disembodied souls of men who have died in the Christian faith, and are admitted to the intermediate state of rest and acceptance; and they are employed as symbols of them, because no other agent or object could

serve as their representative. No other beings exist in such a form, or have passed through such a change in the mode of their existence as to present any analogy to human beings who have undergone death, and now survive as disembodied spirits.

Another class of symbols that are used in this relation, are the dead bodies of the witnesses (Rev. xi. 8-11), and of the dead who are to be raised at the last resurrection (Rev. xx. 11-15). That the dead bodies of the two witnesses symbolize the dead bodies of witnesses who are to be put to death as martyrs, is plain from the fact there is nothing else that they can represent. They cannot represent living human bodies, as, instead of bearing them a resemblance, they present to them the greatest contrast. They cannot represent dead bodies of any other order of intelligences, for there is no other order who are subjected to death. As, then, they cannot be used on the ground of analogy as the symbols of others, they must be employed on the ground of exact likeness, as the symbols of bodies like themselves of slaughtered witnesses of Jesus; and they are used as symbols of their own order, because no other body or object could serve as their symbol. There is nothing that bears to them such a resemblance as to fit it to be used as their symbol. If it was to be foreshown in the visions that the bodies of the slain witnesses of Jesus were to be kept unburied, exposed to the gaze of the nations for three years and a half, and then publicly raised from death to immortal life and glory, and taken up to heaven, it was necessary that they should be employed as their own symbol, and these great events represented by a spectacle exactly like that which their slaughter, preservation unburied, exposure to the general gaze, and public resurrection and assumption to heaven, are to form.

In like manner, the dead bodies of the dead of the last resurrection which are to be given up by the grave, the sea, and death, are symbols of the real dead bodies that are then to be recalled to life. They cannot be symbols of living bodies; for they present a contrast to them, instead of an analogy. They cannot represent any other order of dead bodies, for there is no other order of intelligent beings whose bodies have been consigned to the grave, the sea, and death,

or the realms of the unburied, and are to be raised to a new life. They cannot be the symbols of mere spirits, without bodies; for they present to them no analogy. They represent the dead bodies of men, therefore, and they are used as symbols of their own order, because no other object could represent them. If the resurrection of the dead who are to be recalled to life at the last resurrection, was to be fore-shown in the visions, it was necessary, from the want of any other appropriate symbol, that the bodies of the dead should be used as their representative, and that their resurrection and judgment should be exhibited in a spectacle that exactly corresponds to that which their actual resurrection and judgment are to form.

In like manner, and for the same reasons, the risen dead, as the two witnesses, the saints of the resurrection (Rev. xx. 4-6), and the unholy of the last resurrection (Rev. xx. 11-15), are used as symbols of the really risen dead of their several classes. There are no beings of a different order whom they can represent. They are used as symbols of the risen dead of their own classes, because no other agents or objects could serve as their representatives.

In a considerable number of instances, men also, in the natural life, are employed as symbols of men in the same conditions, exerting similar acts, or suffering similar evils; because those conditions and acts are peculiar to men in the natural life, and no vision could exhibit men as existing and acting in those conditions, except one that presented in miniature the scene itself. Such are the kings and the various classes that make up their armies under the sixth seal, who, at the sight of Christ coming in the clouds to take vengeance, "hid themselves in the dens and rocks of the mountains, and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand?" As no other beings are to exist in such a condition, meet such a spectacle, be terrified by such an impending doom, and utter such a cry; so there are no others that could serve as their symbol to represent them at that great crisis. In order to the exhibition of the event, it was necessary that they should appear in their own persons, and that the vision

should be itself a literal picture of what the scene foreshown is to be.

In like manner, under the fifth and sixth trumpets, while the symbols—the locusts and monster horsemen—that inflict the woe, are of a different order from the agents—the Saracens and Turks—whom they represent, those on whom the woe is to be inflicted, appear in their own persons, as men who have not the seal of God on their foreheads, and who were of communities that worshipped the works of their own hands; and the reason was, that there was no other symbol that could represent these classes so as to indicate their peculiar character, and distinguish them from others who were intermixed with them. In order to show the peculiar class of persons who were to suffer the woe, and the reason of its infliction, it was necessary that they should be presented in the vision, and serve as representatives of their own order undergoing the avenging judgments of those trumpets.

So likewise, under the first, the third, the fourth, and the fifth vials, men who are to suffer the plagues inflicted under those symbols, are exhibited in their own persons, because no other representative could exhibit them in their peculiar relations and acts, as the vassals of the beast, as the slaughterers of the martyrs of Jesus, and as blasphemers of God. To show that they are the parties, in distinction from others, on whom those plagues were to fall, it was essential that they should appear in the visions, and present in their persons an exact likeness of the men on whom the evils predicted by the prophecy are to fall. And so in all the other instances in which men appear as symbols in the visions. They are used to symbolize themselves, because no other symbol could represent them in the peculiar scenes, exerting the peculiar acts, and suffering the extraordinary inflictions that are foreshown in those visions.

And finally, Satan is used as the representative of himself and his own order of angels in the vision of his binding and imprisonment (Rev. xx. 1-3). That he is not the symbol of men, is seen from the fact that he is distinguished from men, whom he is no longer to deceive; and that the express object of his binding and imprisonment is to preclude him from access to the nations whom he aims to delude and

seduce to revolt. He cannot represent the unfallen angels, as instead of resembling, he presents the greatest contrast to them in character, condition, and agency. He must, therefore, symbolize himself and his own legions; and the reason that he is used as his own and their symbol is, that no symbol of a different kind could represent him in his peculiar nature, character, and agency, and show that he is to be the subject of such a binding and imprisonment.

It is thus apparent, 1. That there are only two relations in which the symbols are used: that of analogy, in which they are employed to represent agents or objects of a different order from themselves; and that of exact likeness, when they are used as representatives of agents or things of their own kind. They present an exact similitude or identity of nature, or else, though of a different species, a general correspondence in all their leading features. They are never employed on the ground of a resemblance in a single particular. 2. That these two great divisions of the symbols are clearly distinguishable from each other, and the most ample means are furnished by their nature, the interpretations that are given of many of them, the conditions in which they are used, and the acts that are ascribed to them, of discerning in which relation they are used. If any agents in the world that belong to a different sphere, bear a conspicuous analogy to them, it is easy to discover and identify them. If no such analogous agents or objects exist, which they can represent, it is certain that they are used as representatives of their own orders in their own sphere. 3. It is manifest that the first great law of symbols, that agents represent agents, acts denote acts, and effects and conditions stand for effects and conditions, holds universally of symbols to whichever class they belong. 4. It is equally certain that the next great law, that that which is represented is of a different order or sphere from the symbol, holds also in all instances where there are agents, objects, and acts of another sphere, to which the symbols present the general correspondence which analogy requires. 5. And finally, it is clear that where no such analogous order of agents, objects, acts, and events exists, the symbols are used on the ground of identity of nature, and because no symbols but themselves could serve as their representatives, and form a clear and

indubitable delineation of the actors and events that are to be foreshown. And these, with the other laws which we have heretofore stated, furnish an ample key to the meaning of the symbols, and make it practicable and easy to work out a just interpretation of them. There is not, for example, we think, one among the symbols of which we have given the interpretation in this article, in regard to the true meaning of which any room for rational doubt exists. There are very few, we believe, of much significance in Daniel or John, the true import of which may not be reached with equal certainty. The only question of moment that is in any measure open to debate in respect to the leading symbols of those prophets, relates, not to their interpretation—that is, to *the classes* of agents, acts, or events, which they foreshow—but solely to their application, or the identification of the periods and individuals in which they have had their accomplishment; and in respect to the main symbols, no room exists for any reasonable doubt in regard to them. The great actors and events foreshown by the visions, are graven on the page of history in the clearest outline and the most vivid coloring, and can no more be mistaken by a careful observer, than the great personages of our own nation could, in a graphic delineation of their public acts, though no mention was made of their names. As the interpreter of such a delineation would simply need to read the ordinary annals and histories of our public men, to ascertain what are the names of the individuals who have performed the most important part in our national existence; so the student of these prophecies, after interpreting the symbols, and ascertaining what *the classes* are of the agents, acts, and events, which they foreshow, has only to turn to the history of the nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa, to detect at a glance, as it were, the identical nations, leading personages, acts, and events, in which they have had their accomplishment. To doubt whether, in the main, they are the counterpart of the symbols, is as unreasonable, as it were to doubt whether the shadows that are cast by the trees, the edifices, the moving beings of a landscape, are really the counterpart, in their sphere, of the objects by which they are projected.

We are now prepared to point out some of the important



results to which these laws lead in correcting the erroneous constructions that have heretofore been generally put, and still are by some expositors, on a large share of the symbols. It will be found that their errors generally spring from their disregarding the necessity of an exact coincidence, or a general correspondence of the spheres to which the symbols, and that which they represent, belong; and assumption that a resemblance of any kind, in some single particular, is the ground of symbolization, and that in looking, therefore, for the counterpart of a symbol, all that they have thought requisite in order to a satisfactory solution, was, to find something that presented a resemblance, or seeming resemblance, though it were but in a single particular. It is to set forth and exemplify this fact, the clear comprehension of which will enable the reader to see where the reason lies of the great diversity of constructions which commentators have put on the symbols, and the endless extravagances and self-contradictions into which they run, that we have presented the foregoing statement of the different classes of the symbols, and the principles on which they are employed. Had expositors made themselves familiar with the general correlation that must subsist between a symbol and that which it symbolizes, and considered the wide difference of that correspondence from a likeness, and perhaps of a very vague nature, in a single particular, such as of appearance, relation, motion, rest, or some other point that does not touch its peculiar nature and office, they would never have run into the blunders that now make a considerable part of their constructions.

That a mere resemblance in a single respect, no matter what its nature or extent may be, is no adequate ground for the use of one of the objects which presents that partial likeness, as a symbol of the other, we have already shown; and it must be obvious at a glance to all; 1. Because such single points of similitude subsist between objects that, in all their main peculiarities, present the boldest dissimilarities and contrasts to each other. Satan, for example, resembles God in the fact that he is an intelligence, while he differs from him infinitely in nature, mode of subsistence, station, rights, character, agency, and every other essential feature of his being and destiny. Is he, then, notwithstanding this

general contrariety, a proper symbol of God, because of his simply being, like him, an intelligent agent? Can any one fail to see and feel that to use that malignant creature,—the great enemy and rival of Jehovah, the traducer of his character and government, the conspirator against his throne, and the seducer of his subjects, who is at length to be defeated in all his great schemes of agency, and precipitated into the abyss of perdition, to spend his eternal years in shame and anguish amid the miserable crowds whom he has betrayed to ruin,—as a symbol of the infinite Being whom he hates and opposes, were a revolting solecism, contradictory to our natural sense of propriety, immeasurably injurious to God, and deceptive to men? Not to reject it as an unpardonable enormity, a monstrous outrage, would universally be felt to indicate a fatal want both of intelligence and moral sensibility. And why? Because it is seen and felt, instinctively, that in order that one being may be a proper representative of another, there must be a general correspondence of nature, station, office, relation, character, and agency. The one must be, in the sphere which he fills, the counterpart of what the other is in the sphere which he occupies; so that all the great features of the one have answering features in the other. A resemblance in a single point is no adequate ground for a symbolic representation.

In like manner, a human body recently dead, has a resemblance in form and structure to living human beings; while in all other respects it presents to them the utmost contrast. It is without perceptive powers, incapable of motion, incompetent to any of the functions that are proper to living beings, insusceptible of pleasure or pain—insensible; and in place of being animated with a principle of life, is in the process of dissolution. Can it then, notwithstanding its difference in all these essential particulars, be a proper symbol of living human beings? Every one sees that it cannot. And why? Because it bears no resemblance to them in their most characteristic features. It is no representative of them as living beings, as having perceptive powers, as subjects of pleasure and pain, as exercising perpetually all the functions of life, as moving, feeling, purposing, acting, enjoying, fearing, suffering, hoping, obeying or transgressing

God's law ; adoring or dishonoring him, performing duties or perpetrating crimes towards fellow creatures as members of the family, the state, the church. It is no more a symbol of living human beings in any of these great essentials of their nature and sphere, than it would be if it bore to them no likeness even in its form and structure. Its resemblance in that particular is no basis for its being used as a symbol of them as living and active agents.

2. But a resemblance in a single particular is no adequate ground for symbolization, because every object bears a resemblance in some relation to a great number of others of the most widely differing nature, and it would be impossible to determine which the particular one was which the symbol was employed to represent. There are literally millions of objects, for example, which an animal—a lion for instance—resembles in some relation or another. Thus, if life is the point of similitude, it resembles in that respect all other organized beings that have life in the world,—men, beasts, fowl, insects, fish of every name and nature. But could any one tell, with no other clue, which of the countless myriads, or which of the orders the lion was employed to represent? There plainly would be no means of proving, or making it probable that it denoted any one order, group, or individual, any more than any other. If the power of self-motion is the point of similitude, the use of food, the susceptibility of pleasure or pain, it resembles all other living creatures also in each of these respects, and there can no more be a ground in that resemblance for its being used as the symbol of any one class or group of them than any other. If its having feet is the point of resemblance, then it has its counterpart in any one class of creatures that have feet, as much as in any other ; and may symbolize men, birds, or insects, as probably as any other class. If color is the point of resemblance, then it may have its counterpart in any vegetable or inorganic object that resembles it in hue, as naturally and as probably as in any class of the animal world, or the world of men. Myriads of objects in the depths of the earth, myriads on the surface, myriads in the vegetable world in autumn, myriads of the tints of the feathered tribes, some even of fish, and innumerable reflections from the clouds, resemble the color of the lion. If that mere color is the point of resemblance, who

could tell which of this innumerable host was the particular one, to the exclusion of all the others, which he was employed to represent? Can anything be more certain than that such a symbolization would be no symbolization whatever; that there would be no means by which it could be determined that any one thing was the one represented, any more than any one of millions of others?

Nothing can be clearer, then, than that the ground on which symbols are used must be that of a general correspondence of that which they represent, with that which is represented; not a mere resemblance in a single particular. The symbol must be in its own sphere, in all its great features, what that which it symbolizes is in its own peculiar sphere; agents answering to agents, characteristics to characteristics, acts to acts, effects to effects, conditions to conditions; and nothing consequently can be clearer, than that expositors who proceed on the assumption that symbols are used on the ground of a mere resemblance in a single particular like that on which comparisons and metaphors are often founded, will run into the greatest and most fatal errors.

We shall now proceed to exemplify this by showing, in the first place, that it is by this misconception of the principle of symbolization, that they have given a class of interpretations that violate the first great law of symbols, that agents represent agents. Thus Mr. Stuart interprets the living creatures, as symbols of God's attributes. He says, "These ζῷα are themselves symbolic of the attributes of the Godhead;" and the reason he gives for this construction is, that, "they serve God with great power," "quickness of intelligence," and "rapidity;" and that the "ultimate meaning" of the symbol is, "God is everywhere present, and executes his purposes by an agency powerful, wise, unremitted, and speedy." He thus makes a supposed resemblance of their mode of agency to God's, "the ground of his assumption that they are symbols of his attributes." Mr. Barnes also presents much the same view of them: "They are symbolical beings, designed to furnish *some representation of the government of God*; to illustrate, as it were, that on which the divine government *rests*, or which constitutes its support—to wit, *power, intelligence, vigilance, energy*." "The idea, therefore, which should be conveyed to our minds is, that

the government of God is energetic, firm, intelligent, and that in the execution of its purposes it is rapid." A supposed resemblance of the manner of their acting is thus the ground also alleged by him of his holding that they are symbols of the attributes or characteristics displayed in God's government of the world.

But this is in violation of the great law of symbolization that agents represent agents. It is a solecism to suppose that the living creatures can symbolize the attributes of God. It implies that his attributes are distinct from himself. If the living creatures are symbols of the attributes of God, how is it that they employed themselves in ascribing to him holiness, omnipotence, self-existence, and eternity, which are among his chief natural and moral attributes? It were to exhibit his attributes as offering homage to himself! Can a greater incongruity, can a more solecistical act be ascribed to God? In like manner, to suppose with Mr. Barnes, that the living creatures are representatives of the characteristics of God's government of the world, *i. e.* of the attributes which he displays in his providential administration, is to exhibit his attributes not only as offering worship to himself, but as representing themselves as having been redeemed by the blood of the Lamb. But the supposition that they are symbols of God's attributes is absurd in every respect. They can no more be taken as symbols of a part of God, than other symbols can be held to be representatives of only parts of the beings or objects which they represent. Are they not as distinct from God, and as absolutely creatures as the elders, the angels, men, or any of the other agents of the visions are? But could the prophecy be involved in greater confusion than to assume that these various creatures are symbols only of certain parts, organs, or powers of the agents whom they symbolized? Those writers have thus fallen into the grossest violation of the laws of symbolization in construing the living creatures as representatives of the attributes of God; and alike misrepresented God and the four-faced beings who stood near his throne, and who expressly proclaimed themselves his creatures, redeemed by the blood of the Lamb, and gave glory and honor to him as their creator. How was it then that these interpreters ran into these solecisms? Manifestly because they imagined that a resem-

blance in a single particular is a sufficient ground for the use of an agent or object as a symbol of that which it resembles; and that where such a resemblance exists, it is no obstacle to the assumption that the representative in the vision is the symbol of that which it resembles in that manner, that it presents a total contrast to it in every other respect. Otherwise, they could not have persuaded themselves that the living creatures are symbols of God's attributes. The reason, accordingly, they offer for their construction is *the likeness*, or supposed likeness of the acting of the living creatures in intelligence, quickness, and energy, to God's agency in governing the world. And on this ground they run into the shocking error of construing the vision as exhibiting God's attributes as distinct from himself, as offering him worship, as celebrating the redemption of themselves by the blood of the Lamb, and as proclaiming that the Lamb had made them unto God kings and priests who are to reign on the earth!

They are wholly mistaken, indeed, in imagining that there is any such resemblance, as they represent, in the agency of the living creatures in the vision, to the agency of God. The acts of the living creatures were corporeal acts, or exerted through their organs of speech and their limbs. God's acts are incorporeal, or acts of a purely intelligent nature. Their acts were finite, and suited to the limitations of their nature. His are infinite, or acts appropriate to his nature. Besides, the living creatures did not exert any acts in the vision, except uttering ascriptions of holiness, omnipotence, self-existence, and omnipresence to God, falling down before the Lamb, and ascribing to him worthiness to take the book and open its seals, because he had redeemed them by his blood, and made them kings and priests unto God, to reign with him on the earth. But those acts are precisely the same as those of the elders who uttered the same ascriptions, and fell down also and worshipped God and the Lamb. Their ascriptions are essentially the same, also, with the exception of redemption by the blood of the Lamb, as those of the angels around the throne, who united with the living creatures and elders in ascribing power, and wisdom, and honor to the Lamb; and as those also of every creature which was in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and all

that are in them, who also ascribed blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, unto him that sat on the throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever. The acts of the living creatures, therefore, were not peculiar to them, and no more presented a resemblance to God's agency in controlling the world, than the acts of the other orders of creatures in the different realms of the universe, who took a part in the worship.

But Mr. Stuart and Mr. Barnes suppose that the throne of the Almighty rested on the living creatures, and was supported by them; and that their acts, therefore, were symbolical of the acts by which God exercises and sustains his administration. Thus, Mr. Stuart speaks of them as "the living bearers of the Almighty's throne;" and Mr. Barnes "as the *supports* of the throne of God, or as that on which it *rests*." But they are wholly mistaken. How could the living creatures fall down and worship the Lamb, if the throne rested on them as a support? Their prostration would have involved the prostration of the throne and him who sat on it, and implied that the Father, like the living creatures, was inferior to the Lamb, and in subordination to him. Their whole fancy that the living creatures presented any peculiar resemblance, in their actions, to the acts of God's government, or the attributes he exercises in them, is thus wholly mistaken. They offer no greater likeness to them than the acts of the elders, the angels, or even the inhabitants of the earth and other spheres. Had those writers been aware of the principle on which symbols are employed, and felt the necessity of finding in that which is symbolized, a counterpart in all its great features to the symbol by which it is represented, they would not have fallen into these gross errors.

The author of the *Apocalypse Unveiled* interprets the living creatures as symbols of the four quarters of the earth; the lion being, he says, the symbol of Africa, the ox of Asia, the beast with man's face of Europe, and the eagle of America. But that is in the grossest contradiction to analogy. Those living beings have not the slightest adaptation to represent the mere unconscious continents, or great divisions of the world. What can be signified by the living creatures uttering homage to God, falling down to worship

him, and representing themselves as having been redeemed by the blood of the Lamb, and made kings and priests unto God, to reign on the earth, if they are mere symbols of the four quarters of the globe? Can a greater solecism be conceived? Was it for the four great divisions of the material globe, that Christ shed his blood and made expiation, in contradistinction from men who inhabit them? Is it they that are made kings and priests unto God, and are to reign on the earth, instead of the risen and glorified saints, who, it is elsewhere shown, are to be constituted kings and priests of God and of Christ, and are to reign with him a thousand years? Such are the contradictions and monstrosities into which they run who disregard the law that agents symbolize agents, and acts represent acts. The living creatures can no more be supposed to symbolize portions of the material world, than the elders, the innumerable hosts of angels, and all other orders that appeared in the visions. Into what an infinite jumble of incongruities would the visions be converted, were such a principle of construction legitimate? The whole revelation would be turned into almost a mere representation of events that were to befall the material globe! Its inhabitants would be excluded from the prophecy altogether!

What, now, is the reason that the writer ran into this senseless extravagance? Simply, that he supposes that the ground of symbolization, instead of a general analogy, is a mere resemblance in a single particular. Thus he gives as "the reason" of his "opinion," that "a new religion is introduced into the world—a system of moral government which is to extend its influence *over the whole world*, and to embrace all governments, kingdoms, and dominions of men." He founds his construction, therefore, on the mere likeness of the four living creatures in number to the four quarters, or great divisions of the globe! a coincidence that does not involve any likeness of nature, station, office, relations, agency, or any other characteristic! And on this slender ground, he involves himself in these revolting contradictions and impossibilities. Had he been aware, that no such faint coincidence, no single resemblance of any kind can serve as the ground of symbolization—that there must be a general correspondence between the symbol and



that which it represents, he would not have run into these repulsive extravagances.

Another conspicuous example of this species of error, is Dr. Keith's interpretation of the symbols of the first four seals, as symbols of four different religions. He holds that the horse is a symbol of a religion, and that the species of religion which it represents is indicated by its color. On that ground, he alleges, that the white horse represents Christianity, the black Mahometanism, the red Popery, and the pale Infidelity. This is in direct contravention of the law that agents symbolize agents, and is, in every relation, in the utmost degree arbitrary, incongruous, and adapted, if admitted, to involve the prophecy in inextricable confusion and contradiction. In the first place, the horseman, not the horse, is the leading symbol of each of those seals. The horse is the mere auxiliary or instrument of the rider. What would be thought of a historian of the great battles of Napoleon, Wellington, and others, in the early part of this century, who should assume that their horses were the most important agents of their contests, gave them their character, and determined their issue? It would be no greater absurdity than that into which Dr. Keith runs, in representing the horses as the leading symbols of those seals. In the next place, a horse has no adaptation to symbolize a religion. What analogy is there between that animal and Christianity? Can any two things be more absolutely unlike? If, moreover, a horse is like Christianity, can it also, in an equal degree, be like Mahometanism? And if like each or either of those wholly dissimilar religions, can it also, and in an equal measure, be like Popery? And if like each of those incompatible religions, can it, at the same time, be equally like infidelity, which is the direct antagonist and denier of all three of them? In the third place, if the horses of the seals are representatives of those four religions, as Dr. Keith is pleased to call them—infidelity is generally regarded as a rejection and denial of the religion of the Bible, not a positive religion of a different nature—of what religions are the red, speckled and white horses of Zechariah i., seen among the myrtle trees; and those of the chariots (Zech. vi.), black, white, grizzled, and bay, that came out from between two mountains, and traversed the various

quarters of the earth? Of what religions, moreover, are the two myriads of myriads of horses of the sixth trumpet representatives? And finally, of what religion are the horses of the armies of heaven, on the one hand, and of the armies of the beast on the other, at the great battle of Armageddon? For it seems, from the summons of the birds to sup on the flesh of horses, as well as of them that sit on them, that there were many horses in the vision of the beast's army at that battle. In what an abyss of difficulties does Dr. Keith involve himself and the prophecy, by his construction?

How was it, now, that he was led into these astounding errors? Simply, by his disregarding analogy, and assuming that a resemblance, or an imagined resemblance in a single particular, is the ground of symbolization; and that when such a resemblance is seen, or supposed to be seen, it is a sufficient proof that it is the ground on which the symbol is used! For the reason that he gives for his construction is, that white, the color of the horse of the first seal, is often used in the Scriptures by a metaphor, to denote the moral purity of that to which it is applied. Hence, as Christianity is spotlessly pure, he assumes that the white horse is its symbol; and then, on that ground, assumes that the other horses are also symbols of different religions; and infers from the colors of the horses, that they symbolize Mahometanism, Popery, and Infidelity. He thus founds his whole construction on the single resemblance, or supposed resemblance of the colors of the horses, to the religions of which he asserts they are the symbols. Had he been aware that no such slight similitude or fancied similitude can be the basis of symbolization; that there must be a general correspondence in station, relation, and agency, between the representative and that which it represents; and that agents must represent agents, acts acts, and effects effects; he would not have fallen into an error so discreditable to his intelligence, and involving so gross a misrepresentation of the prophecy.

The construction placed by Daubuz, Frere, Irving, and other writers on the witnesses, is another instance of this false interpretation. There is scarce a vision in the Apocalypse, a true understanding of which is more essential at

the present time, to a just judgment of the great system of events that is revealed in the prophecy. If the witnesses are representatives of persons of their own order, and their slaughter and resurrection symbolize on the principle of exact likeness, instead of analogy, the real slaughter and resurrection of faithful witnesses of Jesus; then the vision foreshows a persecution and martyrdom of the faithful witnesses that is yet future—an event of which it is of the utmost moment the church should be apprised; on the other hand, if these symbols are not used on that principle, there is no knowing what they do indicate; as there are no analogous persons whom they can represent, nor any analogous events which their slaughter and resurrection can symbolize. To err, therefore, in the construction of them, is to err in respect to one of the most important visions, and to involve the whole prophecy in inextricable difficulty. Yet those writers interpret the witnesses as symbols, not of living intelligent agents, and therefore men, but of the Old and New Testaments, and represent the martyrdom of the witnesses, as denoting the suppression of the Scriptures, and their resurrection, as symbolizing their restoration to use and authority.

But this is against the great law of analogy, that agents answer to agents, acts to acts, and conditions to conditions. A living, conscious, active witness who proclaims the truth on the subjects of which his office as teacher calls him to speak, bears no analogy to an unconscious, voiceless book. Nor does the martyrdom of such a witness bear any analogy to the discountenance and suppression, by a civil power, of such a volume. A book cannot of itself utter a testimony. It must be read by a living person in order that the truths which it contains may be known even to him; and it must be read aloud, and its contents proclaimed by the reader as a witness, in order that they may be known to any besides him who reads it. The public denunciation or prohibition of the use of such a book, therefore, does not bear any analogy to the slaughter of living witnesses. Such an act does not affect the book itself, which has no power of spontaneously uttering its contents. It exerts its power solely on the living beings who must read it in order to learn and proclaim its contents; and its effect, as far as it produces any,

is simply to withhold them from perusing its teachings and proclaiming them to others. Their construction, therefore, is in the grossest contravention of analogy. There is a strong likeness between a living original utterer of a testimony, and a living reader of that testimony recorded in a volume, to an audience; but there is no likeness between the living utterer of the testimony and the testimony itself which he utters, and which is inscribed in a book. To suppose them to be counterparts of each other, is to confound the agent with the act he exerts, and the cause with the effect produced by it.

Moreover, if the principle of their construction were allowed, so far from confirming their interpretation, it would involve the meaning of the symbol in the utmost uncertainty. For if the witnesses are symbols of books, who can demonstrate that the Old and New Testaments are the books which they represent? Or if they are counterparts of the symbol, who can show that a thousand other volumes are not also included in the representation; creeds, confessions of faith, acts of councils, the works of the fathers, of the reformers, and of a crowd of later writers? Would not every volume which contained quotations from the Old and New Testaments, and that taught the facts in any measure, and truths of those inspired writings, be entitled to be considered as included in the symbolization? The effect of such a symbolization would accordingly be to raise all such works to a level in authority and sanctitude with the word of God itself! or rather a depression of the word of God to a level in truth and authority with the writings of uninspired and erring men! That would indeed be something like a deprivation of the word of God of its authority, if not a slaughter of it.

Why now is it that these writers put upon the symbol this preposterous construction? Simply, as far as we can judge, because they imagined there is a resemblance between a living witness who utters a testimony, and the testimony which he utters; whereas, though they are intimately connected as a cause is with its effect, there is no similarity between them whatever. The witness is a living intelligence, who addresses living fellow-intelligences; the things testified by him are facts, truths, warnings, commu-

nicated to him by God, through his word, that are themselves without consciousness, and without active power. The things testified no more resemble the testifier, than a will resembles him who makes it, a letter resembles its writer, or any other effect resembles its cause. If, instead of such a resemblance of nature, they proceeded on the fancy that there is a similitude in the office which a testifier and that which he testifies fills, they were in an equal error. A living witness, who delivers a testimony by his voice, is a conscious voluntary agent, in communicating the facts and the truths of his testimony. A book is not a conscious voluntary agent in communicating its contents to readers or hearers. Its relation to them is wholly passive. It is by the voluntary act of the reader that he becomes possessed of its contents, and that others who hear them read become possessed of them. It is thus on the assumption that such a shadowy and imaginary resemblance may be the ground of symbolization, that they founded their absurd construction. Had they realized that, as the witnesses are living voluntary agents, their counterpart must also be living agents; and that as their death and resurrection were real, the death and resurrection of those whom they represent must also be real, because there is no analogous death and resurrection which the witnesses of Jesus can be supposed to undergo; and thence that the witnesses must be human beings, inasmuch as there is no other order of bodied intelligences who can be put to death and raised to immortal life and glory;—they would have been withheld from so gross and reasonless a misrepresentation of the prophecy.

A still more surprising example of the perversion and degradation of the symbols by this method of construction, is Dr. Keith's interpretation of the angel from the sun-rising, having the seal of the living God to seal his servants on their foreheads, as the representative of the Asiatic cholera of 1832! We know not that he could have made a more senseless and discreditable blunder. There not only is no analogy between them, but Dr. Keith's construction implies that all the victims of that pestilence throughout Asia, Africa, Europe, and America, were the servants of God; and that their dying of that disease made it publicly and conspicuously certain that they were. Into what lower

depth can blundering ignorance or fanatical folly descend? What now was the ground on which he inflicted so shameful an outrage on one of the most majestic symbols of the Apocalypse, both from the grandeur of the agent and the beauty and graciousness of his office? The first reason he gives is, that angels were sometimes the ministers under the old dispensation of judgment; which is no proof that this, as a symbol, was such a minister. It is but a possibility at most. But his main reason is, that the angel ascended from the sun-rising, and advanced towards the west; like the cholera which originated in Hindustan and spread to the west! And on that slight similitude, which is equally predicable of a crowd of other things—the drift of the wind, the wafture of clouds, the rush of tides, the flight of birds, the flash of light in the morning, and the advance of darkness at evening—he builds a construction which assumes that the office of the cholera was to distinguish the servants of God from all others by a conspicuous mark; and implies, therefore, not only that all who perished by that disease, whether Hindoo idolaters, Persian fire-worshippers, the votaries of the Grand Llama, Mahometans, Greek, Catholic, and Protestant Christians, Jews, and infidels, were the servants of God; but that they alone were his servants, and consequently that his pure worshippers were then universally swept from the earth. For if death was the seal, and all the eminent servants of God were sealed, then all his eminent servants were consigned to the grave by that pestilence.

We might add many other similar instances, but these are sufficient to show that the great principle on which writers proceed in those of their constructions in which they disregard the great law that agents represent agents, and acts denote acts, is that any resemblance of a symbol to that which it is supposed to represent, no matter how vague and uncertain it is, is a sufficient ground for symbolization, and may be taken as a proof that the thing it so resembles is that which it is employed to denote.

We shall in a future number show that most of their other errors are referable also to the same false assumption.

## ART. II.—AN EXPOSITION OF ROMANS XI. 12, 15, 25.

BY THE REV. JOHN RICHARDS, D.D.

THAT the Jews are still God's covenant people, and, though at present under sentence of rejection, their eyes closed in unbelief, they will nevertheless be converted and saved as a people, is generally admitted. Those who deny the premillennial advent of our Lord, contend that they will be converted concurrently with the Gentile nations, in perhaps equal proportion, for any given time, according to the amount of Christian effort directed towards them specifically for their conversion. The advocates of a premillennial advent suppose this view is false; that, as a people, with sporadic exceptions, multiplied indeed to a limited extent in connexion with Christian effort, the veil will continue to be on them until the elect Gentile church is gathered in at the termination of the present dispensation. They believe the coming dispensation will be marked, among other things, by the restoration of the chosen people to divine favor, even the spiritual conversion of the whole nation, and with accompaniments extraordinary and commensurate with the grandeur of such an event. Jerusalem is now trodden down of the Gentiles; but this shall not always be—there is a period when the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled. Blindness now rests on the nation; but it only waits for the fulness of the Gentiles to come in, when the veil will be removed, and so all Israel shall be saved.

These two positions seem to depend mainly on the question whether God is gathering in an elect church through a course of struggling and depression on their part up to a certain period, which shall suddenly terminate by the interposition of some great event—the introduction of a new economy, in which election shall find no place, but universality be the characteristic; or whether, without the interposition of any great event, the two economies shall slide into each other by insensible gradation, and by the operation of just such causes and influences as now exist. But the latter view is so environed with difficulties, judging from all the

history of the past, and from the present condition of the church in its best portions, and indeed from the undeniable facts of human depravity, that its advocates are forced to qualify the magnificent descriptions of the millennial state which the Bible gives, and deny that a period will ever arrive in the history of this world when either all Israel will be saved, or all the Gentiles. In short, the millennium is to be only the present state of things greatly improved, as New England compared with Italy or Japan, or it may be when a majority, however small, shall be members of the true church, that is be truly converted. This of course perpetuates the economy of an elect church—selection from a multitude—and continues that church in a struggling, depressed condition, until removed to a higher sphere, as now, by death, the climax of the curse. This may be good so far as it goes; and had God revealed nothing more we should be bound to acquiesce with rejoicing. But we believe God has spoken more glorious things than these, and that Christians shut their eyes to their own mercies who so limit the promises, and, by a perverse interpretation, so strip the visions of the prophets, speaking as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, of their true meaning.

Especially do we think the apostle Paul in the eleventh chapter of his epistle to the Romans, teaches a different doctrine—that he contemplates an absolute conversion of the world when God has gathered in that church which is to live and reign with Christ in the millennial age. In justification of this we propose to offer a few remarks on the 12th, 15th, and 25th verses of this chapter.

Verse 12. "Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness?"

Verse 15. "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead?"

Verse 25. "For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery (lest ye should be wise in your own conceits), how that blindness in part is happened unto Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in."

In verse 12th, the word fulness (*πληρωμα*) is used in reference to the Jews, and is to be taken in a general, rather than



in a specific sense. It is evidently used in contrast with *fall* and *diminishing*, and must mean, therefore, restoration to divine favor, or, as in verse 15th, the receiving of them back. The fall, diminishing, and casting away of the Jews, occasioned great blessings to the Gentiles. Their restoration, their reception back, will occasion far greater blessings to the Gentiles—so much greater as to justify a comparison to a literal resurrection of the dead. The apostle may have had in mind either the number of those who should be converted, or the wonderful nature of the change, or more likely both.

But in verse 25th, *fulness* relates to the Gentiles, not to the Jews, and is used in a more specific sense, meaning *complement*, that which is wanting to make up the whole. The blindness of the Jews will remain till that definite number of Gentiles be truly converted, which God has ordained shall be converted during the period of the rejection of the Jews, and then the blindness of the Jews shall be removed—they shall be converted. And after that, the greater blessings promised shall be poured out on the Gentiles. It is important not to confound these two meanings of the word *fulness*. Fulness of the Jews in verse 12th is their restoration, reception, conversion in a body. Fulness of the Gentiles in verse 25th means the filling up of a definite number during the period of the rejection of the Jews; and it does *not* mean the greater blessings consequent to the Gentiles on the restoration of the Jews.

But why does fulness, it will be asked, in the latter case mean *complement*, and not, as Professor Stuart maintains, abundance simply—"until an abundance of Gentiles be come in"?

1. Because complement is its usual meaning, as in the following examples: Matt. ix. 16. That which is put in to fill up (the πληρωμα) taketh from the old garment, and the rent is made worse. Mark viii. 20. Twelve fillings up (πληρωματα) of baskets of fragments. Gal. iv. 4. When the fulness of time was come—its completion. Eph. i. 10. In the dispensation of the fulness of times. Rom. xiii. 10. Love is the fulfilling of the law—full complement of it. 1 Cor. x. 16. Of his fulness have we received, even grace for grace. Eph. iii. 19. In whom dwelleth all the fulness of

the Godhead bodily. Complement, in its rigid geometrical sense, is what remains of any quantity, of which a part has been taken, as of ninety degrees after any arc has been subtracted, *e. g.* thirty degrees, the complement is sixty. It so happens that the strict definition applies exactly to the instance in verse 25th, "fulness of the Gentiles." As on supposition a thousand millions were the full number God had designed should come in before the restoration, and one hundred millions had already come in, then nine hundred millions would be the complement, or fulness. When we say that *complement* is the usual meaning of πληρωμα we do not intend the most rigid geometrical sense, but the somewhat looser—*full quantity*; which is very different from abundance. In all the instances cited in Schmidt's Concordance, we find none which can mean abundance simply. Every one means either full quantity or full number, or else that which is wanting to make up the full quantity or number. "I will come unto you in the fulness of the blessings of the gospel of peace." "In whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily"—not abundance simply, but absolute fulness. If Paul had supposed himself standing at the very beginning, before a single Gentile had come in, he might have used the same language, and then πληρωμα would have been the full number—the thousand millions, as instanced above, and not nine hundred millions, the mathematical complement.

2. Because *abundance* is a relative term. If compared with the number of Gentiles for eighteen centuries past, who have lived and died unbelievers, the number of believing Gentiles is very small; and where in the Bible is there authority for supposing the proportion will be greatly different up to the time of the restoration? After the restoration there will indeed be abundance compared with the number of those who had perished in sin previous to the restoration, but not before. There is no propriety, therefore, in saying, as Professor Stuart does, that "*now* an abundance of Gentiles have come in, and may we not hope that soon a copiousness, a πληρωμα, will come in?" For thus there is no definiteness to the idea. We might as well say that a thousand years ago, or four hundred years ago, a πληρωμα had come in. Certainly, at those periods, a great number had

come in—in the relative sense an abundance. But the restoration did not come, it has not yet come, nor is there any future time when it could be expected, if *πληρωμα* and abundance are such fluctuating, illusory terms. What is abundance? Is it a million, or a hundred millions, or a thousand millions? Unless we can fathom the purposes of God, and know what he means by abundance, the language furnishes us with no guide, and therefore *πληρωμα* cannot mean abundance simply, according to any estimate we may make.

3. Because, unless there be some limit to the abundance that shall come in before the restoration, there will be no place for the greater blessings consequent to the Gentiles upon Israel's restoration. These blessings are to be, numerically and extraordinarily, "as life from the dead" to the Gentiles—so much greater that the former things, the previous gatherings, shall hardly come into mind or be remembered. Such must be the intent of the comparison. But this could not be if the spiritual resurrection or anything like it were to take place before the restoration. There is, therefore, an absolute necessity for limiting the abundance, in order to any clear apprehension of the passage. That limit, known only to God, marks the *πληρωμα*, it bounds the number of the elect church. It bounds also the period of the present economy.

4. Because the word *πληρωμα* in the Greek has the article before it; *το πληρωμα των ιθιων*, *the fulness*, not *a fulness* or *an abundance*, but the precise complement.

For these reasons we say *fulness* in verse 25th means, not abundance simply, but complement, the filling of a destined number at a point of time yet future. When that time arrives, the Jews will be converted in a body—"and so all Israel shall be saved." That also will be the undoubted signal for the universal conversion of the Gentiles—the subjects of the greater blessings, the first fruits of the millennial age. The synopsis of the verses then is this. The fall and dispersion of the Jews at the first advent was the occasion of great blessings to the Gentiles, by opening the door of the gospel to them. The restoration of the Jews at the second advent will occasion far greater blessings to the Gentiles, even as life from the dead to them. Blindness, in part, has happened to Israel; to a very great part it has continued

eighteen centuries; it will continue till the destined number of Gentiles be come in. Then the veil will be removed, the Gentiles will be converted, the millennium will have come.\*

We proceed next to offer some remarks on the blindness spoken of in verse 25th, and which the church by general consent has considered judicial. This we are led to do from the manifest tendency, at present, to impugn this old and wide spread conviction.

The apostle says, "Blindness . . . . . hath *happened* unto Israel." How did it happen? By chance? Not at all. The translation is unfortunate, for the Greek is *γίγνεται*, *exists*, or *is upon*—no tinge of the idea of chance. And whence does blindness exist in the mind of Israel? By God's appointment: this is the only ultimate answer. Yet in saying so we exclude not their own voluntary agency. We assert and maintain their most free coöperation in the produc-

\* Prof. Stuart's interpretation of verses 12th and 15th is such that we are doubtful of his meaning. But if we understand him, he is surely wrong in respect to verse 15th, and inconsistent with himself.

On verse 12th, he says, "The sentiment of the whole is: If now the degradation and punishment of the Jews for their unbelief has been the occasion of rich and numerous blessings to the Gentiles; then surely their restoration to favor, their full reception, will redound still more to the spiritual riches of the world." In this we entirely concur, and suppose that verse 15 utters the same sentiment in stronger language. In this we were confirmed by reading Prof. Stuart's paraphrase of the verse. "If the rejection of the Jews on account of their unbelief, has been the occasion of reconciling many of the Gentile world to God, what shall the reception of them back to the divine favor be, but as it were a general (spiritual) resurrection!" But after some criticism on *ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν* and allusion to Ezekiel's valley of dry bones, we are surprised at the following variation of the paraphrase, "What shall the *πρόσληψις* of the Jews be, but a general resurrection of them, such as Ezekiel has described, i.e. a great, general, and wonderful conversion of them to Christianity!"—in which the reference of *them* can be no other than to *the Jews*. What shall the reception of the Jews be, but life from the dead, to *the Jews*. Or to repeat the whole verse—If the casting away of the Jews be the reconciling of the Gentiles, what shall the reception of the Jews be but life from the dead to the Jews!—in which the antithesis of the verse is destroyed, and also the concinnity of the verse with verse 12th marred. Did Prof. Stuart mean to be so understood? We cannot make anything else, grammatically, of it. If such be his meaning we are quite sure it is a wrong interpretation. And the two paraphrases seem to be inconsistent with each other. Moreover, he is unique in his opinion, so far as our reading of Poole and later commentators has extended.

tion of this blindness, just as much as we do of any other class of men who become great sinners;—the antediluvians, when violence filled the earth, or the nations after the flood, who relapsed into idolatry. There is no special occasion of perplexing this subject with the consistency of free agency and God's sovereignty. This difficulty, if difficulty it be, meets us everywhere. And yet, "known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world;" must we not add also, foreordained? If in the first age of the new dispensation "the people of Israel were gathered together, for to do" to the Lord Jesus whatsoever God's "hand and counsel *determined before* to be done," why should not the continued rejection of him for eighteen centuries, be referred to the same hand and counsel?

Christians have been in the habit of calling this blindness of the Jews a *judicial* blindness. It is true the term judicial is nowhere found in the Bible. But is there no ground for it? Suppose all the retributions which overtake nations and individuals in this world for sin, of which they were forewarned, are in some sense judicial—as who can reasonably deny—are not the retributions which have overtaken the Jews of so marked a character, do not they stand out so pre-eminently before the eyes of all nations, as that their blindness may be called, emphatically, *judicial*; so that while other nations suffer for their sins by God's appointment, we may give intensity to that idea in the case of the Jews, by applying the epithet *judicial*? In their case, we are to consider the superior degree of light they possessed and resisted, aggravating their criminality above others. We are also to consider the comminations of Jehovah, clearly announced through the Old Testament, and repeated by our Saviour. Let us glance at a few:—

Deut. iv. 26. "I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish from off the land whereunto ye go over Jordan to possess it; ye shall not prolong *your* days upon it, but shall utterly be destroyed."

27. "And the LORD shall scatter you among the nations, and ye shall be left few in number among the heathen, whither the LORD shall lead you."

Jer. ix. 15. "Therefore thus saith the LORD of hosts, the God of

Israel; Behold, I will feed them, *even* this people with wormwood, and give them water of gall to drink.

16. I will scatter them also among the heathen, whom neither they nor their fathers have known: and I will send a sword after them, till I have consumed them."

Ezek. xx. 6. "In all your dwelling-places the cities shall be laid waste, and the high places shall be desolate; that your altars may be laid waste and made desolate, and your idols may be broken and cease, and your images may be cut down, and your works may be abolished.

7. And the slain shall fall in the midst of you, and ye shall know that I *am* the LORD.

8. Yet will I leave a remnant, that ye may have *some* that shall escape the sword among the nations, when ye shall be scattered through the countries.

21. Notwithstanding, the children rebelled against me: they walked not in my statutes, neither kept my judgments to do them, which *if* a man do, he shall even live in them: they polluted my sabbaths: then I said, I would pour out my fury upon them, to accomplish my anger against them in the wilderness.

22. Nevertheless, I withdrew my hand, and wrought for my name's sake, that it should not be polluted in the sight of the heathen, in whose sight I brought them forth.

23. I lifted up my hand unto them also in the wilderness, that I would scatter them among the heathen, and disperse them through the countries."

Add to these Christ's words concerning Capernaum, Bethsaida, and Chorazin—his declaration, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin;" and this, "If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" And, above all, the imprecation of the Jews themselves, uttered by their highest constituted authorities. "Why? What evil hath he done?" said the agitated Pilate; and taking water, he washed his hands before them, and said, "I am innocent of the blood of this just person; see ye to it. Then answered all the people, and said, His blood be on us and on our children"—AND ON OUR CHILDREN.

Who can read these threatenings, with the correlated promises, who can contemplate the declarations of Christ, and the awful imprecation at the murderous trial, and especially

who can contemplate the history of the nation for eighteen centuries, and feel that the epithet *judicial* is not justly applied to their blindness? No nation has possessed and resisted such light—not the descendants of Ishmael or Ham; for they never had in former ages, nor have they now the Holy Scriptures, nor have they, in any such sense as the Jews, crucified the Lord of glory. Their blindness is not to be compared with the blindness of the Jews, neither the evils they have suffered. Have not the Jews possessed the Scriptures of the Old Testament all along down? If their copies have been few, they have yet possessed by tradition the main facts of their former history, with the principles involved.

But on this point, why need we travel out of the record of this very chapter? It would seem as if the apostle had settled it:—

“What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded,” Rom. xi. 7.

And when the question is raised, by whose agency were they blinded; or if any prefer, by whose agency were they permitted to blind themselves? The answer plainly is: God blinded them, or permitted them to blind themselves. For the apostle immediately shows what his own opinion was, by the quotations he makes from Deuteronomy and the Psalms:—

“According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear; unto this day. And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling-block, and a recompense unto them: Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back always,” Rom. xi. 8–10.

Prof. Stuart, in commenting on this latter quotation, remarks:—“It is enough to say at present, that the apostle, in making this quotation, need not be supposed to design anything more than to produce an instance from the Psalms, where the same *principle* is developed as contained

in the assertions which he had made, i. e. the ancient Scriptures speak of a part of Israel as blind and deaf, as in deep distress, and under heavy punishment because of their unbelief and disobedience. What happened in ancient times may take place again; it has, in fact, happened at the present time."\* Evidently, from the quotations, the apostle intended to give the idea of a judicial blindness, not a judicial punishment merely, but a judicial blindness and punishment.

This is still further evident from the following view, where the apostle unfolds the reason of the divine administration. He declares that the stumbling of Israel was not intended by God to extend to an entire and hopeless fall—from whence they should never recover. On the contrary, the design was that, by occasion of it, salvation might come—the door of the gospel might be opened to the Gentiles. "I say, then, have they stumbled that they should fall (irrecoverably)? God forbid; but rather through their fall salvation is come to the Gentiles." This surely recognises a special agency of God for a special purpose. And we cannot see why the whole divine procedure should not be called judicial.

It may be urged here as a further reason that the gospel was fairly offered to the Jews—was pressed upon them in all paternal kindness on the part of God, and in all fraternal kindness on the part of his messengers, Christ and the apostles.

"O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not," Matt. xxiii. 37.

"And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem," Luke xxiv. 47.

"But when the Jews saw the multitudes, they were filled with envy, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming. Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge

---

\* *Com. in loc.*



yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles," Acts xiii. 45-46.

"And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word, Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive. For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with *their* eyes, and hear with *their* ears, and understand with *their* heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them. Be it known, therefore, unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and *that* they will hear it," Acts xxviii. 25-28.

This favor, of having the gospel first preached to them, the Jews could not claim, in the remembrance of their awful guilt. How exceedingly was that guilt enhanced when, after the demonstrations at the day of Pentecost, and the faithful and affectionate labors of the apostles in preaching the gospel to them, they perseveringly thrust it away. Did not Paul—when in the course of his mission at Rome he quoted Isaiah to them—believe the blinding was judicial? No language could express that idea more directly and perspicuously than Isaiah's, and never was a quotation made more aptly, and never was a prophecy fulfilled more to the letter.

Yet it is said there are no peculiar obstacles which oppose the conversion of the Jews more than in the case of other nations, *e. g.* the Ishmaelites, the Hamites, or any heathen people! To such an assertion we are strongly inclined to say, "*credat Judæus, non ego.*" For what are the facts? The Jews have been scattered among all Christian nations for centuries, with access to their literature, and with the good influences of the Christian spirit to a considerable extent before their eyes, and conversions have been exceedingly rare. "*But they have been persecuted and repelled.*" So have the descendants of Ham, and these have been converted in great numbers, even under the *iron heel* of oppression. Suppose the Turks and Arabs were distributed all over our country as the Irish are, without a government and without power; is there no ground to believe they would be

converted from their Islamism? One grand reason of the stern sway of that error is the consolidated state of the people, and the great central power at Constantinople and the capital of Persia. Destroy these, and let the people be scattered all over the world, and the dogmas and the influence of the Prophet would soon give way. On the other hand, let the Jews be collected again in Jerusalem and Palestine, with the temporal power of six or eight millions of people under a government; and without extraordinary influences of the Holy Spirit, such as the world has never yet witnessed, we should expect their obstinacy to be increased, and their conversion a hundred fold more difficult. If scattered over the world their blindness remains; consolidated, it would augment. But in *existing* circumstances, the fact is notorious, and we should have said undeniable, that the Jews are the most inaccessible to Christian influences of any people in the world—which we attribute to a judicial blindness. If, now, persecution be assigned as a reason for that blindness, why are we not justified in saying, the persecution is also by divine appointment? “Ye shall become a hissing and a bye-word among all nations.”

“Blindness, *in part*, hath happened unto Israel.” How great a part? The apostle of course spoke of his own time; but the history of that time—that is, from the day of Pentecost to the time when he wrote—as we gather from the Acts and the Epistles, shows that that part was a very large part. It is true the Spirit was poured out on Jews on the day of Pentecost, that there were Jewish converts in all the Christian churches, and that probably the Epistle to the Hebrews was addressed to a church composed of Jewish converts. But when we contemplate the rancor of the natives generally towards the apostles, and especially Paul, we are forced to the conclusion that *απο μέρους, in part*, means a very large part—the scattered exceptions being, as it were, a drop in the bucket. The great, the overwhelming body of the nation rejected Christ. We cannot accede to the remark, “It is worthy of especial notice, that at the very time he (Paul) admits their blindness in part, the principal success of the gospel was among the Jews.”\* The success at first, “be-

---

\* *Missionary Herald*, March, 1849, p. 101.

ginning at Jerusalem," was of course greatest among Jews, but from that time the proportion of Jewish to Gentile converts diminished. And had there been but half, or the tenth part as many, it would have been enough for the apostle's argument.

Professor Stuart presents the case in a just light. "The Jews are one to the present hour; one nation separate from all others as really as when they had exclusive occupation of Palestine; one in religion, one in unbelief with regard to Christianity. That a few individuals are of a different character, and have been in every age since the commencement of the Christian era, abates nothing from the force of this general remark. The apostle himself has reference to exceptions somewhat numerous, which existed in his time, when he says in our text, 'Blindness, *in part*, is happened to Israel.' The expression is kind and sparing to the Jews. He means to say that he does not accuse all of them without discrimination; for some there were who, like himself, were true believers in Christ. In later ages this number was greatly diminished. It has remained exceedingly small down to the present hour. There are now some conspicuous exceptions, indeed, in regard to unbelief; but at the present time there are not enough justly to apply to the Jewish nation the saving exception which the apostle designs to indicate, when he says that 'blindness, *in part*, is happened to Israel.'"\*

In accordance with this, the writer of "Missionary Tract, No. 3, New Series," published by the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, estimating the Jews at three millions, says, "the converts in Europe are reckoned at four thousand." And these, we presume, embrace very nearly all the converts in the world. In view, therefore, of history and acknowledged facts, it strikes us as remarkable to hear it asserted, "The obstacles to the success of missions to the Jews are not by any means so peculiar or so comparatively great as has generally been supposed."† We do not think it has generally been supposed that missions to the

---

\* Sermon—Ordination of the Rev. W. G. Schauffler, page 7.

† *Missionary Herald*, April, 1849, p. 101.

Jews would be fruitless. Now, as formerly, a remnant is found to listen to the gospel, and are saved. But the efforts of all Protestant missionary societies in their behalf for the present century, have most certainly demonstrated peculiar obstacles in the way of making an impression on them—showing the obstacles to success as great “as has generally been supposed.”

In view also of Rom. xi., the following passage from the same page of the *Missionary Herald* as that last quoted, strikes us with some amazement.

“The idea so commonly prevalent, that a *judicial blindness* has come upon Israel, in consequence of their crucifixion of the Son of God, precluding their conversion as a people, until the arrival of some great prophetic era and peculiar divine interposition, seems to have no proper scripture warrant. The apostle Paul speaks only of their being blinded in *part*, and protests that only *some* of the branches have been broken off, and that they are not *cast away*, as a people; and it is worthy of especial notice, that, at the very time he admits their *blindness in part*, the principal success of the gospel was among the Jewish people. He could have meant no more than that, though they had been God’s peculiar people, and favored beyond all others with light and knowledge from heaven, they had fallen into the same blindness with the rest of mankind; but that whenever the rest of the world should embrace the gospel and come into the kingdom, the Jews would do the same.”

On this our first remark is, we are at issue on the question whether or not there is a prophetic era before which the Jews as a people will not be converted. We affirm there is. The writer, if we understand him, denies. We urge our interpretation of verse 25. “Blindness in part is happened to Israel *until* the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.” Is not here an era (more properly an epoch) before which the blindness will not be removed? Most certainly. What is it? It is the time when the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in. And what is fulness of the Gentiles? Complement we say—that number which God has ordained, which has been making up ever since the door of the gospel was opened to the Gentiles, and will be completed in God’s own time. It is not the *great* ingathering—the “life from the dead,” conse.

quent on the receiving back of the Jews. The writer seems to confound two things, viz. *fulness of the Jews*, and *fulness of the Gentiles*; or if he does not confound them, he makes them both the same *sort* of fulness—the same in respect to universality. We contend there is a heaven-wide difference. Fulness of the Jews, “how much more their fulness,” is indeed universal, at least general,—their conversion as a people; but fulness of the Gentiles in verse 25th, is not universal or general, for the reason we stated; that if it were, there would be no room for those greater blessings, that “life from the dead,” spoken of in verse 15th. Verse 25th does, therefore, mark an epoch before which the Jews will not be converted as a people; and the proper scripture warrant is the true interpretation of the three verses under consideration.

Our second remark is, that the writer’s reasoning to show that there is no such epoch is inconsequent. What if the apostle does speak only of their being blinded *in part*, and protest that only some of the branches were broken off, and that they are not cast away as a people; may they not be blinded in part until a certain time, when the blindness shall be removed from the whole? And may not some of the branches be broken off until a certain time when they shall be grafted in again? And may they not be cast away as a people for a certain period, at the close of which their restoration (fulness) as a people shall take place? It seems to us that these latter conditions are just what the apostle implies, and that the writer adduces the partial blindness and excision and the non-casting away to no purpose, to disprove a great prophetic era before which the Jews will not be converted.

Our third remark is, that the writer’s conclusion in the passage quoted above, begs the entire question on the meaning of verse 25th. He says, “The apostle Paul could have meant no more than that, . . . whenever the rest of the world should embrace the gospel and come into the kingdom, the Jews would do the same.” We say the apostle meant directly the contrary,—that whenever the Jews should embrace the gospel, and come into the kingdom, the rest of the world would do the same. “Blindness . . . to Israel, until the fulness”—the destined number—“of the

Gentiles be come in ;" then the Jews shall be converted as a people. When this latter occurs, the rest of the world will be converted. "What shall the receiving of them"—the Jews—"be, but life from the dead" to the Gentiles?

There is, then, some great prophetic era and peculiar divine interposition awaiting, before which the Jews will not be converted as a people. That they will be converted in part—a small part—exception wise, as they have all along since the days of the apostle, we have no doubt, and even more, in some proportion to the means used ; but, as a people, they will not be converted until the prophetic era arrives.

In support of this conclusion, we cannot help adducing here the passage in Luke xxi. 24 :—

"And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations : and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled."

Perhaps no passage has been more tortured by commentators than this. Rosenmuller says it means, end of the world, when nations shall be no more. Lightfoot says it must be limited to the generation or two whom Christ addressed, because of verse 32, "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled." Others limit it to the time of Constantine. Others, otherwise.

Rosenmuller's opinion we utterly reject. Jerusalem, in any sense, is not to be always trodden down. Dr. Lightfoot's interpretation (and with him Dr. Robinson mainly coincides) is untenable on his own premises. For suppose the destruction, the distress, and the dispersion to occur during the life of that generation, what shall be said of the prolongation of that dispersion—the facts of eighteen centuries? Does Christ mean, Jerusalem shall be trodden down of those Gentiles only—Titus, Domitian, Trajan—until built up by Adrian as Elia, or possessed by Constantine when the empire became Christian? It is absurd. Jerusalem, in every sense, has been trodden down of the Gentiles until this day. And though it were granted that Christ's words,

in Luke xxi. 5-36, and in Matt. xxiv. 1-43, related only to the commencement of the desolation and dispersion, and thus were qualified by the verse, "This generation shall not pass away," &c.; still in view of the actual treading down thus long, it is the height of absurdity to say, the qualification of the verse extends to the prolongation. This generation shall not pass away till Jerusalem has been trodden down of the Gentiles eighteen centuries!!

"Ἀχρι πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ ἰθύναι, in Luke, we consider the equivalent of ἄχρις οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπιλάβῃ, in Romans.

"Until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (Luke).

"Until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in" (Rom.).

Jerusalem has been trodden down of the Gentiles for eighteen centuries. God has been "taking out from the Gentiles a people for his name" during the same period. We believe he will continue to "take out" until the full number is completed, and that that completion is a common measure with the treading down of Jerusalem; in other words, a great prophetic era before the completion of which the Jews will not be converted as a people. We do not now agitate the question whether the Jews will literally return to Jerusalem. They may or may not; but rejecting the hypothesis that they will, then Jerusalem, spiritually, will be built up, or cease to be trodden down of the Gentiles—that is, the Jews will be converted, when the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in (Romans); when the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled (Luke).

In this connexion we also invite attention to the passage in Acts xv. 14-17:—

"Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them (λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν, take out, select—not the whole) a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things."

The apostle quotes *ad sensum*, following neither the Hebrew nor the Septuagint, and criticism may raise ques-

tions. Yet we are struck with the occasion and application of the quotation. Peter declares the design and issue of his mission, to *select* from the Gentiles "a people for his name." This selection has been going on ever since; for at no time, manifestly, has there been a universal gathering from any nation, tribe, or kindred. Does this mean the *full number*, the destined *complement* of which Paul speaks?—"And to this agree the words of the prophets: as it is written, After this (selection has been made) I will return," and rebuild dilapidated Jerusalem (fulness of the Jews? Rom. xi. 12). For what purpose? "That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called." Does this mean the greater blessings (Rom. xi. 15), the great ingathering, consequent on the receiving back of the Jews, that shall so much exceed the complement of verse 25th, as to justify the comparison, "life from the dead?" Let us lay the passages together:—

"Now, if the fall of them *be* the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness? . . . . For if the casting away of them *be* the reconciling of the world, what *shall* the receiving of *them be*, but life from the dead? . . . . For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery (lest ye should be wise in your own conceits), that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in."

That is:—The fall of the Jews occasions great blessings to the Gentiles. Their fulness—reinstating—will occasion much greater. If the rejection of the Jews open the door of the gospel to the Gentiles, what shall the reception of the Jews be, but life from the dead to the Gentiles? Blindness is on Israel in part, but only till the destined complement of the Gentiles is made up. Let us now look at the other passage.

"Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things."



That is:—The providence of God is manifested in selecting from the Gentiles a people to be saved. The word of prophecy concurs with the manifestations of providence; for, recognising this gracious visitation of the Gentiles and judicial rejection of the Jews, it declares that after the selection has been made, God will return and reinstate the Jews. Also, God's further purpose—that the residue of men, even all the Gentiles, may seek after the Lord and be saved.

It seems to us these two passages contemplate the same events in a similar order, and that they clearly indicate a great prophetic era, and special divine interposition, before which the Jews will not be converted as a people.

Do we then oppose missions to the Jews, or Christian effort for their conversion? By no means. God speed to every missionary effort judiciously directed, whether of the American Board, or of the American Society for meliorating the condition of the Jews. "But, if the Jews are not to be converted till the arrival of some great prophetic era?" Most certainly. God will give his own measure of success, and that should be sufficient stimulus for us. What—shall we not labor for the Jews, when the Scripture says Israel is blinded but in part? We may sympathize with the afflictions of the Jews, and mourn over their blindness, and labor for its removal, holding the interpretation we do, as much as those who hold contrary views. For whether the prophetic era and special divine interposition shall be with miraculous accompaniments or not, we have no idea God will dispense with the co-operation of his church during the interval. The path of duty is not affected by such a consideration now, any more than in the time of Paul. "Even now there is a remnant, according to the election of grace." We believe that remnant will appear in greater number, according as greater efforts are used by the Christian church. But we are not to close our eyes to the meaning of the Scriptures through any exuberance of hope, or fond attachment to a theory not well grounded, or by any romantic views of the missionary work. Especially we are not to say, if such be the meaning of the Scriptures, let God take care of his own purposes—I will never lift another finger in the missionary work. God preserve us from such

a spirit, lest, like Jonah, we be swallowed up without the grace of repentance and escape.

It is with pain we have read the statements in *Missionary Tract No. 3*, and *Missionary Herald No. 101*, above referred to. We believe they go upon an entire misapprehension of the passage in *Romans xi*. And it is with feelings far other than what we fear will be imputed, that we have ventured on an examination of that passage. We would know the truth, fearless of any apprehension that the truth will repress any Christian effort for the conversion of either Jew or Gentile.

---

### ART. III.—THE PARABLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY THE EDITOR.

THE Parables of our Lord comprise an important part of the information that is given us in the New Testament, respecting the nature of his kingdom on the earth, the great characteristics that are to mark it under the administration he is now exercising, and the new dispensation under which it is to be placed, and the new form it is to assume, at his second coming. And they are, in other respects, among the most attractive of his discourses; displaying, in an eminent measure, the truth of conception, the beauty of taste, and the all comprehensive knowledge, that shine, like the glow of noon-day, in all his teachings. Like paintings wrought by great artists, of well known historical scenes, they are easily intelligible in their main points, to every class of readers who carefully contemplate them; while they involve a comprehensiveness of views and a depth of wisdom, which the greatest and wisest are never able fully to grasp.

We propose to point out the principle on which they are employed, to distinguish the classes of which they consist, to give the rules by which they are to be expounded, and to exemplify them by interpretations of a portion of them and perhaps of the whole.

The term parable, in Greek *παροιμία*, literally signifies a

putting side by side; and in discourse, denotes the putting of men or things of one sphere of life or nature, by the side of God, Christ, or usually men, in another, for the purpose of comparison, contrast, or illustration. The agents and objects that are used for exemplification, though usually fictitious, are always taken from the sphere of nature, and the conditions and acts ascribed to them, are such as are proper to them; while the acts which they are employed to represent or illustrate, are usually those of God in his relations to men as moral governor, or of men in their relations to him as the subjects of his law. Thus in the first parable, *Matt. vii. 24-29*, the wise man who built his house upon a rock, though fictitious, is taken from the sphere of nature, or from men in the material arts of this world, and the acts ascribed to him, are appropriate to him as a wise human being in that sphere; while the man whom he is employed to illustrate, is taken from men in their religious sphere, or their relations to God as subjects of his moral government. In like manner, the foolish man who built his house upon the sand, is taken from men in the sphere of the mechanical arts, while the man whom he exemplifies belongs to men in their religious relations to God.

The first great characteristic of the parable thus is, that it employs agents, objects, conditions, acts, and effects, in one sphere of nature or life, to illustrate and represent intelligences and their conditions and acts in another sphere.

The next great characteristic is, that the agents that are used as representatives, always stand for agents in the sphere which they are employed to illustrate, acts stand for acts, effects for effects, and conditions for conditions.

And thirdly, an intelligent and living agent always represents, or is the counterpart of an intelligence in the sphere that is exemplified;—sometimes God, sometimes Christ, but most usually man or men. This is seen from the parable of the householder that planted and let a vineyard—who represents God—*Matt. xxi. 33-44*, while his son represents Christ, and the hirers of the vineyard who defraud the owner and kill his son, represent the Jewish priests and rulers: and from the parable of the sower, in which the sower, a man taken from the sphere of husbandry, represents men in the ministry of the gospel; and the fowls—agents from the

animal world, stand for devils who act against men in the sphere of religion: in the parable or allegory of the vineyard also, Isaiah v. 1-7, in which the husbandman represents Jehovah of hosts, and the vineyard the house of Israel; and the allegory Psalm lxxx. 8-19, in which Jehovah himself is the planter of the vine, the vine represents the people of Israel, and the boar out of the wood, and wild beast of the field that destroyed it, the Assyrians, Babylonians, and other nations who conquered them, slaughtered them, carried them into exile, and reduced them to desolation and ruin.

A parable is thus a discourse, in which an agent or object in one sphere represents an agent in another, for the purpose of illustration; and it proceeds throughout on the principle of analogy; agents standing for agents, acts for acts, and effects for effects. If God is the agent, he acts as his own representative, but in a different sphere from that which his representative agency illustrates. He acts, for example, as a husbandman in bringing a vine out of Egypt and planting it in Palestine; but the agency which he exemplifies by that act, is his transferring the Israelites from Egypt and establishing them in the land of Canaan. If man is the agent, he acts in some mere secular sphere, as a builder, a vine-dresser, a sower, a steward; while he represents men in their religious sphere as the subjects of God's law. If animals or vegetables are the representatives, they appear in their natural sphere, but represent men or devils in the sphere of religion, or acting in respect to men in their relations to God. The realm from which the illustration is drawn, is thus always different from that which it is employed to exemplify.

Parables are of two classes: First, those in which it is simply declared that that which is to be illustrated, is like that in some specified particulars which is used for its illustration; as in the parable of the mustard seed, which simply affirms that the kingdom of heaven is like a grain of mustard seed, which though the smallest of seeds, when grown becomes the greatest among herbs. This is a mere comparison of the kingdom of heaven to that plant, in respect to the smallness of the germ from which it springs, and the greatness to which it attains at its maturity. There is no exact counterpart presented by the mustard plant to the kingdom of heaven throughout its sphere, as a combi-

nation or body of human beings renewed by the Holy Spirit, believing in Christ, and acting in their relations to God. There is no enumeration of all the conspicuous points of resemblance between them; such as the analogy that light bears in its agency on the plant, to the influence of knowledge on the mind; and that water, of which the juices of the plant are formed, presents to the quickening influences of the Holy Spirit on the soul. The comparison is confined to two particulars. Secondly, those in which the agent or object, which is used for illustration, presents a general counterpart to that which it is employed to illustrate: so that the one is in its own peculiar sphere, what the other is in the sphere that is proper to it: agents answering to agents, conditions to conditions, acts to acts, effects to effects. Thus in the parable of the vineyard, Matt. xxi. 33-44, the vineyard answers to the Israelites; the householder who planted it, to God who established them as his chosen people in Palestine; his hedging the vineyard, digging a wine-press, and building a tower, to the analogous measures God employed to make the Israelites an obedient people; the letting of the vineyard to husbandmen, to God's intrusting the culture or care of his people to the priests and rulers who were placed over them; the sending of the servants to receive the fruits, God's sending the prophets to warn and persuade his people to the obedience they had promised to yield; the beating and killing of the servants, to the persecution and slaughter by the Israelites of the prophets; the householder sending his son, to God's sending Christ to the Israelites; the husbandmen's killing the son, to the Israelites killing Christ; and the punishment which the lord of the vineyard inflicted on the murderers, to the punishment God was to inflict on the Israelites for their rejection and crucifixion of Christ. Here is thus, throughout, a correspondence of the actors, acts, and events of the two spheres. What the householder, the vineyard, the husbandmen, the fruits, the servants, the son, and their several acts and catastrophes are in their sphere; that God, the Israelites, the priests and rulers, the prophets, Christ, and their respective acts and the events that befel them, are in theirs. The one are used on the principle of analogy, as the counterpart and representatives of the other. The difference of this class of parables from the

other thus is, that the correspondences between the representatives and that which is represented, are general, or extend throughout the great peculiarities of their sphere, in place of being confined to one or two leading particulars. The principles, however, on which the two are used, are precisely the same; the representative in each always being of or acting in a different sphere from that which is represented, and agents always standing for agents, acts for acts, and effects for effects.

As the parables generally are designed to illustrate the kingdom of heaven, of God, and of Christ, it is essential, in order justly to understand them, to know what that kingdom is. Some suppose it to be a kingdom of God *in* heaven, in which the redeemed dwell during their intermediate state, and are to reign after their resurrection. That, however, is a total mistake. The kingdom of God is the kingdom which the God of heaven was to institute on the earth, in the days of the kings symbolized by Nebuchadnezzar's image, and which is to break in pieces and consume their dynasties, and is to stand for ever. Dan. ii. 44. It was proclaimed accordingly by Christ, at his announcement of himself as the Messiah at the commencement of his ministry, that it was at hand; it was instituted in its first form at his ascension: and it is revealed, Dan. vii. 9-28, that at the destruction of the ten-horned beast, Christ is to come in the clouds, and be invested with the dominion of the earth, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; and that the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, are then to be given "to the people of the saints of the Most High; whose kingdom is to be an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." It is a kingdom *on earth*, therefore, not a kingdom in heaven. It was accordingly proclaimed by great voices from heaven at the sound of the seventh trumpet, that the kingdom of the world—*του κοσμου*, the earth, is our Lord's and his Messiah's, and he shall reign through the ages of ages. It is a kingdom in this world, then, of which Christ is to sway the sceptre for ever and ever.

Others suppose it to denote—at least in some instances—as in the parable of the leaven, Matt. xiii. 33, the gospel or Christianity. But that is an equal mistake; as the gospel

of the kingdom is distinguished from the kingdom itself which it respects, Mark i. 14, 15; and Christianity, that is the facts and truths of the Christian religion, are not an empire, and cannot be reigned over as legal subjects by Christ. Others again suppose the kingdom to be the visible church; but that is an equal error; as the tares, the representatives of false members of the church, are exhibited as not belonging to the kingdom, but as introduced into it by the devil, and to be gathered out of it by the angels, and destroyed at the coming of the Son of man. The kingdom of God then, which is the kingdom of heaven, is not a kingdom in some other part of the universe, nor is it this material globe, though the globe is its scene; neither is it Christianity, or the visible church: but it is the body of believers in Christ who are brought by renovation by the Spirit into the relation of children and heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ, in whom, therefore, he dwells by his Spirit, and of whom such as have died are, at his second advent, to come with him, and be invested with authority as priests and kings, and reign with him over the living nations of the earth through their endless generations. With this definition, and this alone, all the parables that relate to it accord; and it is this kingdom in some of its stages, or characteristics, that a chief part of the parables are employed to illustrate.

At Christ's utterance of his second parable, Matt. xiii. 2-9, his disciples asked why he addressed the people in parables. He answered that it was because his hearers generally had adopted a false notion of the kingdom God was about to establish, and had become so wedded to it by prejudice, party feeling, and ambition, that they were unwilling to have the truth directly propounded in regard to it, and turned away from it with aversion and disgust. Their hearts had become gross, and their ears dull, and they closed their eyes lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart the truth as it was, be turned from their favorite error, and become Christ's sincere and hearty disciples. That this wilful error and unbelief related to the nature of Christ's kingdom, is seen from the reason he gives for his speaking to them in parables:—"Because it is given to *you* to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven; but to them it is not given. For who-

soever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance; but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath. Therefore I speak to them in parables; because they seeing see not, and hearing they hear not; neither do they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, which saith: By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive." Matt. xiii. 11-15. It was in reference to the kingdom of heaven, therefore, that they were thus prejudiced and blinded; and they were so occupied and perverted by false notions of it, that they would not and could not see the truth when it was plainly presented to them. And that stubborn persistence in error, that wilful rejection and perversion of the truth, and substitution of their own false theory in its place, was the reason that Christ addressed them in parables; which, while easily intelligible, and eminently adapted to engage and instruct candid, docile, and earnest inquirers after truth, left them, if they chose, to adhere to their errors and prejudices.

The great principles of administration here announced, that whosoever receives and loves the truth shall be led on to a larger and more abundant knowledge of it; and that whosoever, on the other hand, does not receive it, but adopts and cherishes error in place of it, shall not be led to the knowledge of the truth, but instead shall be surrendered to a larger dominion of error; is a law of God's government still, and is exemplified now, as it was then, in those who receive and those who reject the teachings of the Scriptures respecting Christ's kingdom. For notions are now held in regard to it, as palpably contradictory to his teachings, and as subversive of its nature, as those of the Jews were, and that are as obviously the offspring of unbelief, pride, ambition, and worldliness; and are adhered to as blindly. They held that Christ's kingdom was to be a mere politico-religious one, much such as that of their great monarchs had been; and that the chief service he was to render their nation was to release them from the domination of the Romans, exalt them to independence, and bring their enemies into subjection to them. A vast crowd now go to the other extreme, and deny that he is ever to reign over his kingdom in this world in person; and arrogate to themselves the office, as



instruments, of bringing the nations to the knowledge and acceptance of his salvation. Others hold false notions of what it is that constitutes men members of his kingdom; some maintain that it is union with a particular church, and some that it is the reception of a certain rite. By others equally false notions are entertained of the moral change wrought at the new birth, the ground of justification, and other fundamental subjects. And it is as true of these parties, who yield themselves up to their own delusive speculations and shut their eyes to the plain teachings of the sacred word, as it was of the false teaching and false believing Jews of Christ's day, that it is not given to them to understand the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but they are left under the dominion of their unbelief, prejudice, and blindness, to go on and follow their false principles to their natural results, and reject the great truths that are antagonistic to them. Such an event as the conversion of a false teacher who has become an ardent partisan, and whose passions are enlisted in the support and propagation of his errors, is scarcely known in the history of the church.

This, which has been exemplified in every age since the proclamation of the kingdom, and never perhaps on a greater scale than now, is indeed a fearful truth, and should be contemplated with awe by every teacher and reader of the word of God. They exhibit a most presumptuous and unteachable spirit, who set up their speculations in opposition to the Almighty, and obstinately adhere to them against his indubitable teachings. They assume to be wiser than he, and make the fulfilment of their wishes of more consideration than the accomplishment of his; and they are justly and naturally abandoned to their delusions, and left to learn their folly by the fatal issue to which it leads. If we would be admitted to the knowledge of the mysteries of the kingdom, if we would know the things that are of God in their truth, greatness, and majesty, they must be approached with the ingenuous and docile spirit of learners; all prepossessions, prejudices, and party aims must be laid aside; the desire to know the truth must alone reign in the heart, and unreserved faith and submission must be given to whatever God teaches, whether it accords with what had before been

believed or not, and whether it confirms or confounds the notions that prevail with the crowd.

Several of the writers who have treated of the parables, have endeavored to classify them according to their subjects, or the relations in which they exemplify the kingdom of God. We prefer to treat them in the order in which they occur in the gospels.

### I. THE TWO BUILDERS.

Matthew vii. 24-27. Luke vi. 47-49.

"Therefore, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not; for it was founded upon a rock.

"And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand. And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell, and great was the fall of it."

This is the form in which the parable is given by Matthew. It is varied by Luke by the statement that the wise man "dugged deep and laid the foundation on a rock;" and that the foolish man, "without a foundation built on the earth." In order to interpret it, we are to consider, 1. The point which it is to illustrate. 2. The sayings, the doer and non-doer of which are compared to the builders. 3. The analogy which the doer and non-doer of these sayings bear to the builders. 4. The analogy of the trial to which they are to be subjected, to the tempest and flood that beat upon the house.

First: The object of the parable, it should be noticed, is not, like that of most of the others, to illustrate the nature of Christ's kingdom. The comparison it institutes, is not of that kingdom to the buildings under the tempests by which they were assailed. No such resemblance subsists between Christ's kingdom and the fate of the foolish builder's house. But the comparison is of the doer and non-doer of Christ's sayings with the wise and the foolish builder. And the

point to be illustrated is, the issue of their obedience and non-obedience respectively in the test to which they are to be subjected. In the trial of the doer of Christ's sayings, he is to stand unshaken, like a house which being built on a rock, cannot be undermined nor swept from its fastenings. In the trial of the non-doer of Christ's sayings, he is to be borne away like a house built on the sand, which, the floods undermining beneath, and the tempest striking above, is overturned, and sinks a shapeless wreck. It is thus the result of his obedience to him who does Christ's commands on the one hand, and of his disobedience who does not keep them on the other, which it is the object of the parable to set forth.

Secondly: The sayings of Christ, the doer and non-doer of which are compared to the wise and the foolish builder. They are the sayings of the sermon on the mount, Matt. v.-vii., which presents in the first place a delineation of the children of God as humble, meek, hungerers and thirsters after righteousness, merciful, pure, peacemakers, and sufferers of persecution for righteousness' sake; and next a series of precepts in which the exercise of those characteristics, along with the renunciation of self and the world, supreme reverence of God, perfect trust in him, prayer, and truth, justice and benevolence towards men are enjoined, and the restraint and repression commanded of all opposite and evil affections. To comply with these injunctions, is to possess the spirit of the divine law, to perform the duties which it prescribes, and to shun the evils which it prohibits; and among the great features of such a life are humbleness, meekness, self-denial, love to God and man, habitual trust in God, prayerfulness, a likeness to the Most High in holiness, righteousness, and mercifulness, a spirit of forgiveness to enemies, and fidelity to God under persecution. These are the sayings, the doer of which is likened to the wise builder who founded his house on a rock; and the non-doer of which is compared to the foolish builder who erected his house upon sand; and they form one of the boldest, most comprehensive, and most beautiful portraiture in the sacred volume of God's children, and present the strongest contrast to the false notions many of Christ's hearers entertained of the characteristics that are acceptable to God. Being the

children of Abraham, is not, as some of them imagined, that which is to insure justification at his bar. Neither is it an observance of the external rites of religion, or a loud and showy profession, and ostentatious performance of some of the acts of religion which he requires; nor is it an eager ambition of the aggrandizement of the church, the subordination of her enemies to her, and the pomp and power of a victorious state, such as many of the Jews were desiring and anticipating. Instead, it is a heart of humbleness, contrition, purity, rectitude, love, faith, prayer, submission, self-denial, and holiness in all its forms. No character could have been drawn more unlike the notions of religion that were held by the priests and rulers, and a large portion of the Jewish people of the period, who were eminently sordid, selfish, worldly, hypocritical, unjust, revengeful, alienated from God, self-righteous, devoted to wealth, pleasure, and power, and dreaming only of a political kingdom that should yield the means of gratifying their sensual and selfish passions, and enable them to satiate their revenge and their ambition on their national enemies.

Thirdly: The analogy which the doer and non-doer of Christ's word bear to the wise and foolish builders. Both the doer in his obedience, and the non-doer in his disobedience, act with a reference to their eternal well-being. This is seen from Christ's announcing that not every one that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he only that doeth the will of the Father who is in heaven; and it is the course which they severally pursue in that reference, that is likened to that of the wise and the foolish builders in their spheres. As the wise builder placed his house on a foundation so solid and stable that neither floods nor tempests could ever sweep it away; so the doer of Christ's word pursues a course by which his eternal well-being is secured. In obeying Christ he places his reliance for acceptance on the ground which God himself has authorized and required, and which he will for ever sustain. The non-doer of Christ's word, on the other hand, pursues a course which makes it certain that his hope of acceptance will not be sustained. He trusts in something he has done that is not a mark of discipleship to Christ; such as having prophesied, cast out devils, or done other wonderful works in Christ's

name. This is the fact with those who now refuse obedience to Christ's words as truly as it was then. As the unbelieving, ambitious, and hypocritical priests and rulers of Christ's time had, notwithstanding their wickedness, a confident persuasion of their acceptableness to God, and thought themselves indeed eminently righteous in the identical acts which bespoke most emphatically their unrighteousness; so the false teachers and false believers of the present day, who reject the most essential parts of the Christian system, and entertain the most erroneous notions of the nature and conditions of salvation, nevertheless universally regard themselves as the genuine children of God, and make their very errors and sins the grounds of their hope of meeting his acceptance. Like those who erect expensive and showy edifices to shield them from the heats of summer and the blasts of winter, where their treasures are to be placed, their families are to reside, and their happiness is to be enjoyed, they flatter themselves they are making by their false religion a sure, ample, and honorable provision for the necessities of their immortal existence.

Fourthly: The analogy of the trial to which the buildings were subjected, to the test to which the religious life or conduct towards God is to be put, on which men rely for their safety and happiness in the future world. The edifices erected by the wise and the foolish builder were assailed by floods and tempests of such violence, as to make it certain that they could not stand, unless built on an immovable foundation. So the religious life, the faith, the service, the righteousness on which men rely for their eternal well-being, are to be put to a test at the bar of God, of such severity as will reveal their true character, and, if false, overwhelm them in disappointment and destruction. Unbelief, self-righteousness, pride, hypocrisy, rebellion, will no more stand the all-searching and all-revealing scrutiny of the final trial, than the building founded on sand could stand the rush of the flood that swept the earth from beneath it, and of the tempest that overturned it from above. What an impressive illustration of their folly and presumption who build their reliance for salvation on a false foundation instead of Christ!

The great truths taught by the parable thus are:—

1. That the conduct of men in respect to Christ's teachings, is to determine their eternal state. There is no character but that which he delineates, as that of God's children, that can meet the divine acceptance. There are no laws but his, the observance of which is obedience to him. They who frame for themselves a different code, and substitute it in place of his, are rebels instead of obedient children.

2. Men who choose the unstable sand for the foundation of the houses which they erect to shelter themselves from the wind and rain, and to contain their families and their treasures, are universally regarded as deficient in discretion. It is seen by all to be a work of weakness and presumption. They who build their reliance for salvation on a false ground, no matter what their station may be, what applauses their doctrines may excite, nor what crowds they may attract to their train, are equally foolish and rash, in respect to their eternal well-being.

3. The ground on which they rest their trust for heaven is to be put to a decisive test. Its real character will appear at their trial at the bar of God, and, if false, instead of insuring their safety, will precipitate them to destruction.

4. Their catastrophe, who do not obey the words of Christ, will be final and awful. Like the man who intrusted himself for security to the house he had built on the sand, and was lost in the flood by which it was swept away—they will be condemned and perish along with the false pleas on which they rely for admission to the kingdom of heaven. "Many will say to me in that day: Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them. I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity," vs. 22, 23.

5. And like the foolish builder who, having lost his treasures, his happiness, and his life, by the very means by which he thought to secure them, and saw his error too late to remedy it, they will carry a sense of their folly with them through the wants and miseries of their immortal existence.

All the characteristics which we have represented as distinguishing the parable, are thus exemplified in this. The things used for illustration are of a different sphere from those

which they are employed to illustrate. Agents stand for agents, acts for acts, and effects for effects. And instead of a single similitude, it presents a general likeness between the representative and that which it illustrates, and belongs, therefore, to the second class of parables.

## II. THE SOWER.

*Matt. xiii. 1-9, 18-23; Mark iv. 3-9, 14-26; Luke viii. 4-15.*

This is the first of a series of parables delivered by Christ at the sea of Galilee, and probably soon after the commencement of his ministry. The multitudes that gathered to hear him were so great, that to avoid their press and make himself distinguishable to all, he took his station on a ship anchored near the land. They were grouped on the shore, gently declining to the water, and sweeping round, not improbably in a half circle, like an amphitheatre. The winds were, doubtless, hushed. An overshadowing cloud, not unlikely, protected them from the sun, and his accents, borne by his omnipotence, reached the crowds on the distant declivity, as distinctly as those who were at hand. The peculiarity of the scenery, the vastness of the assemblage, their eager expectation of instruction, his extraordinary character, the novelty and beauty of his teachings, must have made it a day of singular interest, and left indelible impressions on thousands of hearts. That Christ should, on such an occasion, have devoted his discourse—not to his vicarious death, not to the method of justification through his blood, not to an exposition of the ancient prophecies respecting him, but to the reception which his word was to meet from the different classes of his hearers, and the nature and progress of his kingdom, indicates that there was peculiar need of instruction on that subject, and implies that mistaken and pernicious notions prevailed in regard to it. That the nation, generally, was to reject their Messiah, they had not conceived. That he was, at his first coming, to exercise the office of prophet and priest only, and that his assumption of the sceptre and throne as their king, was to be postponed to a distant age, had never entered their thoughts. They

conceived of him as a mighty prince and conqueror, and imagined that he was at once to exert his kingly power in freeing them from the domination of the Romans, raising them to freedom, happiness, and glory, and making them the awe and admiration of all other nations.

"Behold a sower went forth to sow : and when he sowed, some seeds fell by the way-side [and it was trodden down—Luke], and the fowls [the fowls of the air—Luke—i. e. the birds] came and devoured them up.

"Some fell upon stony places [upon a rock—Luke], where they had not much earth ; and forthwith they sprang up, because they had no deepness of earth ; and when the sun was up, they were scorched ; and because they had no root they withered away.

"And some fell among thorns, and the thorns sprang up and choked them.

"But others fell into good ground, and did yield fruit [that sprang up and increased and brought forth—Mark] some thirty, and some sixty, and some a hundred fold.

"Who hath ears to hear, let him hear."

After stating to the disciples that he spake the parable because the hearers generally entertained such erroneous notions of him and his kingdom, that they were unprepared to hear the truth directly propounded, he gave the interpretation of it.

"Hear ye, therefore, the parable of the sower.

"The sower soweth the word."—Mark. "The seed is the word of God."—Luke.

"When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he which received seed by the way-side."—Matthew. "Those by the way-side are they that hear ; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved."—Luke.

"But he that receiveth the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it [for a while believe—Mark]. Yet hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while ; yet when tribulation ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended."

"He also that received seed among the thorns, is he that



heareth the word; and the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful."—Matt. "And that which fell among thorns are they, which, when they have heard, go forth and are choked with cares, and riches, and pleasures of this life, and bring no fruit to perfection."—Luke.

"But he that receiveth seed into the good ground, is he that heareth the word and understandeth it; which also beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some a hundred fold, some sixty, some thirty."—Matthew. "But that on the good ground are they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience."—Luke.

This parable is not put forth, like many others, as designed to exemplify the kingdom of God. Its object is not formally announced in the parable itself, but is shown, in the interpretation, to be to illustrate the reception which the word of the kingdom was to meet from the different classes of hearers, one of whom only are children of the kingdom. It belongs to the second species of parables, and presents a wider range of correspondences than any other in the series, and exemplifies, in a very clear and beautiful manner, each of the parabolic laws.

Thus, the illustrative agents, objects, acts, and effects, are taken from the sphere of husbandry, and they are employed to exemplify men in their sphere as hearers of the word of the kingdom of God. The sower of the seed in the parabolic sphere, answers to the preacher of the word of the kingdom. The seed answers to the word, the act of sowing to the act of proclaiming the word, and the different kinds of ground on which the seed fell, to the different kinds of men who hear the word. There is an analogy, also, between the passiveness of the ground in receiving the seed, and that of the hearers in receiving the word. As it is the sower who determines what seed, and how much shall be sown, so it is the preacher, not the hearer, who determines what word, and how much, shall be proclaimed; the office of men as hearers, like that of the ground, is simply to receive it. The birds of the air, also—living agents—answer to the devil and his angels—intelligent agents—in their sphere; the act of the birds answers to that of the

devil; the action of the heat of the sun on the seed that sprang up on the rocky ground, answers to the influence of trials on the corresponding class of hearers; the action of the thorns in choking the seed that fell among them, answers to the influence of cares and pleasures in intercepting the word from fruitfulness; while the fruitfulness of the good ground answers to the obedience of the honest and good-hearted hearers. There is thus a perfect analogy throughout the parabolic sphere and that which it is employed to illustrate. The agents, objects, acts, relations, and effects in the one, correspond to agents, objects, acts, conditions, and effects in the other. The great points to be unfolded in the interpretation are the analogy of the several kinds of ground to the corresponding classes of hearers, and of the agencies that affect the issue of the seed in those kinds of ground, to the influences that affect the issue of the word with the corresponding classes of men. As these analogies are different, and are to be separately considered, they make the parable equivalent to four separate parables.

First: The analogy of the ground by the way-side, from which the birds picked up the seed, to the hearers from whose hearts the devil takes away the word; and of the action of the birds to that of the devil. The ground by the way-side—that is, immediately along the pathway—had not been dug and prepared for the reception of seed. It was not simply left uncultivated, but had been beat down by the perpetual tread of passengers. The seed that fell on it, accordingly, instead of burying itself where it fell, as it would in a loose soil, remained on the surface, and was crushed by the foot of the traveller, and picked up by the birds. This ground obviously answers to that class of hearers who have not received a religious education, whose minds have been left in their natural ignorance of God, whose consciences are uncultured, and whose moral sensibilities, instead of being unfolded, have been repressed by false and sceptical sentiments, and on whom, therefore, the word of the kingdom falls without impression. It meets no sympathetic feeling in their hearts—it excites no emotion. It only enters the intellect, and is contemplated speculatively. They feel no interest—they have no faith in it, so that the devil as easily catches it away, as the birds seized and devoured the seeds

by the way-side ; and the mode in which he accomplishes it, bears a strong analogy to their picking up and bearing off the seeds. They grasped and swallowed them. He expunges the word as effectually from the minds of the insensible and unbelieving ; sometimes by engaging them in other things, so that it sinks from their memory ; sometimes by raising objections to it as not the word of God, and divesting it thereby of its divine and authoritative character ; and sometimes by superseding it by counter doctrines of their own, or of their schools and leaders. By preventing it from being held as the word of God, he takes it away from their hearts and consciences, as effectually as though he expunged it from their recollection. Thus he beguiles multitudes of this class with the persuasion that their first and chief duty is to devote themselves to the pursuits of this life, and that religion has no paramount claims on them till the great worldly objects at which they aim are achieved. One is persuaded that he must first complete his education, make himself master of his trade or business, get settled in life, make a fortune, rear a family, acquire a reputation in his profession, or secure an honorable rank in society ; and from the hearts in which this feeling and ambition reign, the word of the kingdom is as effectually expelled, as a law of supreme authority, as though it had never been heard. A sense of their relationship to God never having been awakened in their hearts, their moral feelings never having been unfolded in reference to him, this world having always been presented to them as the great theatre of their activity and happiness, they feel no compunction for excluding God and his government from their thoughts, and confining their interest and attention to the affairs of this life. The devil thus strikes the word as effectually from their consideration as though he blotted it from existence.

From others he takes it away with equal effect by exciting objections, which imply that it is not the word of God, and divests it thereby of its authority. Of these are the various classes of sceptics. One maintains that our nature precludes the possibility of a revelation from God ; and holds, therefore, that however remarkable the Scriptures are in many respects, they cannot be the word of God. Another persuades himself that there are errors, contradictions, or imper-

fections in the sacred word, that prove that it cannot be divine. A third claims that its origin is too obscure to command an implicit faith in its authenticity and inspiration. By divesting it thus of its divine character, and reducing it in their estimate to the rank of mere human writings, the devil as thoroughly takes it from their hearts as the word of the kingdom, as though he swept it altogether from their knowledge.

From others he takes it away by persuading them that they themselves are, at least in their reason, as divine as God is, and that their speculative views and moral feelings, therefore, are of as high authority as his word. Of these are the deists, rationalists, and pantheists of the present age; and much like them were the Sadducees of Christ's day. They take their own bewildered faculties and senseless reasonings as their guide, and making themselves their deity and law-giver, either wholly set aside the word of God, or wrest and pervert it to suit their fancies.

Satan thus acts as much according to his nature in this sphere, as the birds do in theirs, in seizing and devouring the seeds; and he sweeps the word thus as completely from the hearts of this vast crowd of hearers, as the birds bore off the seeds from the wayside on which it fell. What an exemplification of his presence wherever his victims are to be found; of his restless activity, and of his boundless craft! What transcendent dupery that he betrays especially the speculative and philosophic tribes whom he makes his vassals, into the belief that the infidel and atheistic systems that emanate from him, are the product of their divine reason, and place them in wisdom and authority on a level with the self-existent and omniscient! Do the birds of the air ever achieve their work more adroitly and thoroughly than he thus does his!

Secondly: The analogy of the rock or stony ground, to the corresponding class of hearers, and of the effect of the sun on the plants that sprung up on that ground, to the effect of trials on the hearers whom it represents.

This ground is quite different from that by the way-side. It is described as rocky, or a rock overspread with a thin layer of soil; and instead of being left untilled and beat down by passengers, it was cultivated, as is seen from the fact that

the seed that fell on it, in place of rebounding and lying on the surface, sank beneath the soil, so that it escaped the birds, and immediately germinated. Owing to the little depth of the earth, the heat of the sun soon spread through its whole mass, and by the greater warmth it occasioned, excited a more rapid germination and growth than took place in ordinary grounds; but for the same reason, it speedily evaporated all the moisture, and withered and killed the plants.

The hearers that answer to this ground, differ in like manner from the former class. They are persons who have received some religious education, and who, taking Christianity to be a reality, think that it will be pleasurable and advantageous to believe and profess it, and gladly, therefore, receive the word respecting it; but instead of a true understanding of it, have only superficial and mistaken views, and are prompted by selfish feelings. It delights them mainly, perhaps, from the self-estimation which it generates, the flattering hopes it excites, the calm with which it tranquillizes conscience, the peace with which it soothes fear, the position it gives them in society, or the aid it yields them in their secular occupations. Their sensibilities are quick, their affections ardent; they are delighted and deceived by the novelty of their thoughts and feelings, and they suppose the new and disguised play of their natural affections is the evolution of the new heart, the fresh and delightful outworking of true piety. They thus present a close analogy to the ground that is employed to represent them. As that, from the superior warmth with which, from its shallowness, it soon became pervaded, caused the seed that fell on it to germinate more rapidly, and shoot up at first a more luxuriant and promising growth; so, in these, the strength and ardor of the natural affections, of which their religion is the product, occasion a higher excitement, and give birth to more strong and imposing manifestations and professions of what seems to be piety, than take place in the truly renovated, who act under the restraint of a profound sense of sin, a trembling self-distrust, and a watchful guard against evil. As the shallow soil answers to these superficial hearers, so the hot-bed and rootless plants which it shoots up, answer to the superficial and short-lived religious affections which these hearers exercise.

The numbers comprised in this class are very great. The crowds belong to it, who are betrayed in times of high religious excitement, into the false belief that they are renewed by the Spirit, and have a legitimate hope of salvation. The specious play of affection, the elation of thought, the rapturous joy they sometimes exhibit, are very extraordinary. Such were crowds of those who a few years ago, in a time of great excitement and delusion, were led by false teachers into the belief that simply to form a strong and emphatic purpose to seek and secure salvation, though from the most selfish motives, was in fact to become religious, and acquire or assume the character to which salvation is promised. Such were they who were duped by the same class of teachers into the persuasion that there is no difference between the selfish and the renovated heart; that they are alike and necessarily prompted exclusively by a reference to happiness, and were thereby led to regard their natural affections, merely because they were directed towards their salvation, as truly religious and sanctified, though they were unmistakably selfish, and without a trace of the genuine love of God, and of holiness. And such are the crowds of others who either from a false notion of the nature of religion, or a misjudgment of themselves, mistake their natural selfish feelings for renovated affections, and suppose they have entered a new and spiritual life, when they have only, under new and extraordinary excitements, passed from one form of their natural, alienated life, to another.

As there is thus an analogy of the thin soil to this class of hearers, and of the short-lived plants which it rapidly shot up, to the religious affections of these hearers, so the action of the sun on the soil and plants presents a striking resemblance to the effect of tribulation and persecution on the religion of hearers of this class. The withering of the plants was the necessary result of the thinness of the soil from which they sprang, and the exhaustion of its moisture. As the plants absorbed and the heat evaporated the water held by the soil, which took place in Palestine, as it does here indeed in a few days in summer, the withering and death of the plants was as inevitable, as though they had been plucked from the earth, or killed by a scorching fire. The indispensable means of their continued growth and life were wanting. A

change in the laws of the physical world would have been necessary to have saved them in that condition from destruction. In like manner the failure and death of the religious affections and hopes of these hearers, naturally and necessarily takes place under the trials to which they are subjected. Under the providence God is exercising over the world, they and all others are put to trials that cause them to show the true character of their hearts, and make it manifest whether they are his children or not. That is a main aim of his administration. All his measures with communities and individuals, are shaped to that end. They can no more avoid showing that they have not the love of God, which is necessary to support men, and enable them to maintain a truly religious life under tribulation and persecution for the word's sake, than the plants springing from a thin soil could fail of showing that they had not the depth of root that was requisite to sustain them in life, and cause them to flourish under a scorching sun. As their religion has its ground altogether in selfishness, the moment it is found that instead of promoting their present happiness, it debars them from enjoyment, subjects them to serious evils, and perhaps endangers their reputation, property, and life, it expires, and they renounce it. They endure but for a time. Afterwards when affliction or persecution ariseth for the word's sake, immediately they are offended. This arises sometimes from the severe self-restraints to which they are required to submit. To give up the indulgence of the passions involves a self-denial that more than counterbalances the gratifications of self-complacency, pride, and hope, which they find in their religion. It sometimes arises from the greatness and distastefulness of the duties to which they are called. To keep up a tone of zealous piety, is to live an artificial life, that at length becomes irksome from its heartlessness, and perpetual interference with their selfish pleasures. It assumes, however, its most decisive form, when their profession of religion becomes a source of discredit, an obstruction to their business, and as in times of persecution, exposes them to the forfeiture of property, to imprisonment, and to death. The selfishness which first led them to profess it, then leads them to renounce it, and regard it with an aversion stronger even than the complacency with which they before embraced it.

As the heat of the sun which first warmed the seeds into life, and stimulated them to a rapid growth, finally, by drying up the moisture of the soil, became the means of their death, so the sinister affections from which the religion of these hearers springs, at length become the means of its extinction. The causes that effect the one are not more efficacious in their sphere, than the causes that effect the other are in theirs. What a graphic picture the parable thus presents of the withering and killing power of tribulation and persecution on this class of hearers! They are emptied of their religious life by trials, as absolutely as plants in a thin soil are of their natural life by a scorching sun. Not a trace of vitality remains in them, and its extinction is final, the implication is. It cannot be rekindled in them any more, according to the ordinary course of God's procedure, than the plants that have withered under the burning heat of the sun, can be recalled to a fresh life and verdure. In what multitudes has this been exemplified in the past ages of the church, especially in seasons of persecution? In what crowds will it again be verified, there is reason to believe, when the great tribulation which is approaching, comes, and the true servants of God are to be discriminated more clearly than ever before from those who are not, and made to show that they are his children as distinctly as though his name was written on their foreheads!

Thirdly: The analogy of the ground in which thorns were rooted and grew up, to the hearers of the corresponding class, and of the action of the thorns in choking the plants, and preventing their reaching maturity, to the influence of worldly cares and pleasures in preventing such hearers from exercising the genuine affections of God's children.

This ground differs as widely from that on the rock, as the rock ground does from that by the way-side. The soil of this is not deficient in depth, nor in the moisture that is requisite for the support of plants under the heat of the sun. Its defect is, that it is inadequately prepared for the seed that is sown on it. It is but half cultivated. Though the thorns that grew on it the previous season were cut away, and the surface turned over by the plough, or dug by the spade, so that it had the appearance of a readiness for the seed that was deposited in it, yet the roots of the



thorns that had long had possession of it, and appropriated its richness to themselves, were not eradicated, but still lay imbedded in it in every direction, and ready to spring up in their natural vigor and luxuriance, the moment the sun's warmth reached and revived them. Though, therefore, the surface had been so far dressed that the seed that fell on it sank within sufficiently to protect it from the birds, and insure its being quickened into life, yet the thorns shot up their stems along with it, and, animated with a more vigorous life, soon overtopped it by their thick foliage, precluding from it the rays of the sun, stinted it with a perpetual shade, and prevented it from reaching maturity.

The hearers who answer to this ground, are obviously of the class who, though aware of the character of their evil affections, and the necessity of eradicating them, yet attempt to be religious, or make the profession, and put on the air of religion, without that change. Instead of eradicating their evil passions and desires, they only, like the cultivators of the thorn ground, remove their conspicuous outgrowths, and veil them, so as to produce an appearance of their extermination, and, content with that external repression, undertake to act, in a measure at least, the part of the opposite affections of the new heart. They do not, like the rocky ground hearers, mistake their selfish for sanctified affections; their peculiarity is, that they satisfy themselves with a mere repression and restraint of their evil affections, instead of an eradication of them, and limit their religion to faint desires, and external professions and forms. They present an exact counterpart, therefore, to the thorn ground, in which, notwithstanding the removal of the stems of the thorns, and the slight culture of the surface by which the seed sown on it was buried and made to germinate, the roots of the thorns were left undisturbed, to sprout with their natural vigor, and shoot up their usual year's growth.

This class of hearers is also very numerous. There are crowds who speculatively admit the necessity of regeneration and a holy life, who yet, instead of a thorough eradication of their evil affections, content themselves with restraining them within the limits of decorum, and exhibiting a public and respectful observance of the forms of religion. They do not directly deny that they are sinners, and need

redemption by the blood of Christ. They do not deny the necessity of faith in his blood, of justification by his merits, and of a supreme love of God. They do not formally hold that a mere selfish religion can meet his acceptance. They do not affect to justify a supreme love of the possessions and pleasures of this world. Yet, notwithstanding these speculative convictions, their evil affections remain as strongly rooted in them as ever. They are only repressed, while their religion, instead of reigning in the heart, and giving character to all the actions, expends itself chiefly in external forms and services—and it is on these chiefly that their hopes are founded.

Such, especially, is the character of numbers in the church at the present day, when the most eager devotion to the cares of the world, the most grasping ambition of wealth, the utmost extravagance in houses, equipage, furniture, and dress, and indulgence with little restraint in the luxuries of the table, and the amusements of the gay world, are scarcely regarded as incompatible with the Christian profession; and when the most rabid and unscrupulous devotees to mammon can, with a few donations to religious and philanthropic objects, purchase a brilliant reputation for piety, and insure, at their exit from the world, a dazzling emblazonry of their virtues from the pulpit and the press.

The action, also, of the thorns on the plants that spring up among them, presents a close analogy to the effect of the cares of the world, and the love of riches and pleasure, on the religion of this class of hearers. The thorns, uninjured and undisturbed in their roots, naturally sprang up with greater energy than the plants germinating among them, and immediately overtopping, choked—that is, stunted them, and, by debarring them from the sun's rays, made it impossible to them to shoot up to their usual height, and prevented them from maturing their fruit. This was the natural and inevitable result of the seeds' springing up in such a disadvantageous position. They could not, from the feebleness of their nature, resist the sinister influences to which they were subjected. To have shot up with greater rapidity than the thorns, to have overtopped them and kept in the sunshine, would have required a reversion of their natures. It is equally natural and inevitable, where the native affec-

tions remain unchanged, however they may for the time be repressed, and the cares of the world maintain their hold on the heart, riches retain their attractions, and the desires of other worldly objects reign in their original strength, that they should choke such a faint and superficial religion, and prevent it from ever rising to the power, and yielding the fruits of genuine piety. Worldly cares and pleasures, the allurements of riches, and the desire and hope of other worldly things, such as reputation, rank, and influence, are precisely the objects that naturally address the unsanctified affections most powerfully, and raise them to predominance in the breast, and precisely the objects and passions that most naturally check and repress religious dispositions and tastes; and the influences to which persons of this cast are subjected by their wants, their ambition, and the customs and fashions of society, are sure to rouse those worldly affections into activity, and cause them to overbear the feeble feelings of an opposite cast, and the faint remonstrances of conscience. Divine providence puts these parties to as effective a test of their hearts, as the other classes of hearers; and it is as impossible, by the laws of their nature, that under the powerful impulses of temptation with which they, like all others, are assailed, their most deep-rooted passions and affections should not be roused to an activity proportioned to their strength, assert their predominance, and overbear all feebler dispositions and sentiments; as it is that under the stimulus of a rich soil, and the quickening heat of the sun, the healthy roots of thorns that have long had possession of the ground should not shoot up with an energy proportioned to their vigorous nature, overtop the grain stalks that spring up among them, and stint and blight them by their deadly shade. The life of such persons is often a continual struggle between a speculative conviction and sense of duty, and a love of the world, and desire still to enjoy its pleasures and honors; but the sense of duty remains but a feeble inoperative power, while the natural affections continue to fill the throne, and sway the sceptre of the heart. No man can serve two masters. One or the other will have the supremacy. Allegiance, at the same time, both to God and to mammon, is impossible. The cares of the world, and love of pleasure and honor, thus

exercise an influence in their sphere that corresponds to that of the thorns in theirs.

Fourthly: The analogy of the good ground which brought forth fruit, to the hearers who receive and understand the word, and yield its appropriate fruits. The good ground is not left in an uncultured state, or disqualified by natural defects or improper treatment for the reception and growth of grain seeds. It has not been trodden down by passengers, so as to prevent the seed that falls on it from entering its soil. It is not left unploughed and undug, like the ground along the way-side. It does not rest on a rock rising so near the surface as to deprive the plants that spring up in it of sufficient root and moisture to enable them to endure the heat of the sun. If such rocks were originally imbedded in it, they have been removed, or sunk to such a depth as to be intercepted from an injurious influence. And no thorn-roots are left buried in it to spring up at the first warmth of spring, and overshadow the grain. If any such originally grew in it, they have been dug up and borne away. It has been subjected by a skilful husbandman to precisely the processes of ploughing and dressing that fit it for the reception of the grain with which it is to be sown, and has in itself all the qualities and conditions that insure the safe and luxuriant growth of the plant, and a certain and abundant yield—of some stalks thirty-fold, of some sixty, of some a hundred.

The hearers who answer to this ground, are those who have been renewed by the Spirit of God, and made meet thereby for the joyous reception, the genial love, and the ready obedience of the word of the kingdom. Their principles and affections are not left in their natural state, and made worse than at first by the hardening influence of bad examples and evil habits. The stony heart has been taken away, and a heart of flesh put in its place. The thorn-roots of selfishness, pride, unbelief, and worldliness, have been eradicated. The views and tastes have received a new cast. The light of the glory of God as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ has been flashed, in its dazzling effulgence, through all the depths of the spirit, and filled it with a sense of the beauty of his perfections, the grandeur of his sancti-

tude, and the blessedness of his service; and his law is written on the heart, and its dispositions and affections brought into harmony with it, so that it becomes easy and natural to obey its commands, and yield the fruits which it prescribes.

There is a like analogy, also, between the growth and fruitfulness of the plants in this ground, and the piety of the hearers which the grain represents. Some of the grain stalks are less fruitful than others, owing, perhaps, to an inferior energy in the seeds from which they spring, some hurtful element in the earth from which they draw their nourishment, exposure to too great heat, to the too violent action of the wind, or possibly to some blight from excessive damp, wounds from insects, a wrench from a tempest, or a stroke from a hailstone. They are affected, in a measure, by their peculiar constitution, condition, and the influences to which they are subjected. They all, however, yield fruit, and richly, though some as much again as others, and some thrice as much, and more.

The renewed hearers of the word, also, differ in like manner in the measure of their piety. They are affected by the peculiarities of their constitution, their conditions, and the influences to which they are subjected. Those who, while enjoying but few aids, are left to struggle with powerful temptations, who receive but imperfect instruction, who are misled in a measure by false teachings, who are drawn into excessive worldly cares, and who are left by the Spirit to fall into darkness and sin, are stinted in a degree, and bring forth but an inferior share of fruit; while others, in more genial conditions, aided by more favorable influences from teachers and associates, and, above all, quickened and refreshed by larger gifts of the Spirit, flourish like luxuriant plants with little interruption, and yield a richer harvest of obedience; and as a good crop is naturally yielded by the good ground, and may be expected with confidence, so it may be expected, with equal certainty, that the word of the kingdom will prove efficacious, and yield its appropriate fruits in their hearts who are thus renewed.

The analogy thus holds throughout between the different parts of the parable, and that which it is employed to exemplify. It presents an exact picture of the several classes of

the hearers of the word, and bespeaks that perfect knowledge of men, of the laws of providence, and of the great scheme of the divine administration, which marks in the most eminent manner the discourses of our Lord. The great truths taught by it are—

1. That under the present dispensation the word of the kingdom is to be communicated to men by preachers whom God assigns to the office. It does not lie imbedded in the mind naturally, as the seeds of weeds and thorns lie in the cultured and uncultured ground. It is to be imparted to them from abroad, or it will not be known; and men are the ministers whom God has commissioned to proclaim it.

2. The mere hearing of the word is not enough. It must be received with sincerity, understanding, love, and faith, or it will not yield its appropriate fruit.

3. The mind, in its natural condition, is not prepared to receive it in that manner. It needs to be renewed by the Spirit of God, to fit it to receive the doctrine of Christ's kingdom with intelligence, ingenuousness, trust, joy, and love; and exercise the peculiar affections and acts which it should excite in the heart.

4. There is but a small share of those who bear it, in whom it appears to find a genial soil, and brings forth the fruits of righteousness.

5. The effect of communicating it to the differing classes of men, is to put them to a test, and cause them to show the true character of their reigning affections. The unbelieving, selfish, and worldly, as surely and naturally manifest that they are not fitted to yield the fruits of righteousness; as the way-side, the rocky, and the thorn ground, showed that it was not suited for the growth and maturity of the grain that was sown on it.

6. They who, like the hearers represented by the way-side, rely on a mere natural religion, will not be admitted to the kingdom of God. Such are the deists, the rationalists, the naturalists or pantheists of the present day—a body embracing vast crowds of the learned and half-learned. Their religion is not the religion of the kingdom of God. They are the identical parties denoted by the way-side ground, and from whose hearts the devil catches away the word lest they should believe and be saved.

7. They whose religion is a mere religion of the natural and selfish affections, are not the children of the kingdom. They will apostatize and renounce their profession when assailed by tribulation and persecution for the word's sake, and God will disown them when they ask admission to his kingdom.

8. They who hope to obtain a place in his kingdom by mere professions and external observances, while they remain the slaves of the world, will be disappointed. They cannot serve two masters. As they give the world their supreme love, they will have to abide by that fatal choice.

9. It is only those whose hearts are made new by the Spirit of God, that yield a true obedience, and will receive a place in his kingdom.

10. There is no hint in the parable, nor in any other of Christ's teachings, that the picture it presents of the reception the word of the kingdom was to receive from men, is not to continue true throughout the present dispensation. The proportion of believing and obedient hearers is now as small, and has been in every age hitherto, as it was during Christ's ministry. The crowds are the hearers represented by the way-side, the rocky soil, and the thorn ground. And that is to continue as long as the word of the kingdom is preached by men in the present mode. It is not to be till Christ himself comes and establishes his kingdom here in its power and glory, and reigns over it in person, that all hearers and all nations are to become obedient, and yield the fruits of righteousness and peace.

---

#### ART. IV.—THE APOSTOLIC COMMISSION.

BY THE REV. J. HARKNESS.

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi. 15, 16.

Jesus Christ had fulfilled all the duties of his priestly office upon earth, and was about to leave it. He had rendered perfect obedience to heaven's holy laws, and offered up prayers for his church. He had endured the punishment of the broken law and the smiting of his Father's sword for the transgressions of the sheep, and had died upon the cross a propitiatory victim for the sins of the world. He had risen from the dead as the acknowledged satisfier of Divine justice for the sins of men—the glorious conqueror of death and the grave, and the infallible security of the resurrection and life of his people; and had spent forty days with his disciples teaching them in things pertaining to the kingdom. The work which the Father had given him to do upon the earth being done, and he about to ascend to be glorified with the glory which he had with him before the world began, in parting from his disciples he addressed them in the solemn words of injunction and promise, which stand at the head of this article, and seem to contain the following things worthy of consideration.

*I. The commission given to the disciples.*

The work enjoined upon the disciples by Christ is somewhat differently expressed by Matthew and Mark. Matthew says "teach," Mark "preach the gospel." The word *Μαθητεύσατε*, used by Matthew, which some have rendered, and very justly, "to make disciples," implies also the act of teaching; for in order to make disciples it is necessary to teach, or instruct men in the doctrines which we wish them to embrace; or to which we wish them to become converts. We cannot agree with the celebrated translator and critic, Dr. Campbell, who renders this word "convert," because it gives it a meaning which neither the word nor the passage seems to authorize, and which far exceeds the meaning of the parallel passage in Mark. The word *κηρύξατε*, used by Mark, signifies merely to publish, to proclaim aloud, and consequently to instruct or teach in the thing published, but not to convert. The words then have precisely the same meaning. If they had not, one or other of the disciples would have misrepresented the Lord.

The duty, then, which Christ imposed upon his disciples was to preach, proclaim aloud, or instruct men in the doctrine



of the gospel. They were to teach men that they are fallen—lost in Adam: morally disinclined to obey God's law, and unable to recover and save themselves; that their redemption could be purchased only by the shed blood of Immanuel, and obtained only through faith in that blood. These, with all the glorious doctrines growing out of them, were to form the topics and the burden of the teaching of the disciples, and consequently of their successors. And doctrines more offensive than these could not be propounded to men; and yet these are the doctrines which the ministers of the gospel are to preach.

## II. *The extent of the commission.*

Matthew describes the extent of the commission in these words, *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, all the nations of the earth. The glad tidings of the gospel were not to be confined to the Jews, who had been God's peculiarly privileged people; they were to be carried to all heathen nations, and the disciples were to become the instructors of these nations. And to the same effect is the language of Mark, when he says, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature;" or, as it might be more literally rendered, "Go ye into the world, everywhere, and preach the gospel to the whole creation."

Such was the extent of the commission given by Christ to his disciples, and how they fulfilled it may be seen in their inspired biographies. They gave themselves entirely to the work. They left all they held dear on earth. They brought all they had in their hands as an offering to the Lord in this service, and pressed all their talents into the work. And they went forth into every country within their reach, in matchless moral heroism; braving all dangers; suffering all cruelties and tortures, death the most dreadful not excepted, doing the will and the work of the Saviour—teaching the nations the doctrines of the gospel.

But this commission, the performance of this duty, was not to cease with them. It is equally obligatory upon their successors, and upon the Christian church they planted and left in the world. It is as binding upon the church in the present day as if it had been given first and only to her. And well may we ask, How *has* she performed—How *is she* performing her duty in this matter? Alas! we may say, not

withstanding all her boasted doings as regards missions, she has done nothing. What are her vaunted contributions? What the gifts of stern self-denial, of severe self-mortification, of sold possessions, for the sake of Christ? Ah! we find not these among her gifts. No! no! gifts like these she does not bestow. The gifts of self-denial she gives not. The professed followers of Christ in these days, give not the widow's mite—their whole living, though in religious cant they frequently speak of doing so. They must have their personal jewels and ornaments, their gay and splendid attire, their magnificently furnished houses, and their sumptuous tables groaning with every luxury; and then, out of the abundance that yet remains, a few cents, or a few dollars, may with great difficulty be wrung, to help a lame or mock obedience to the command of the Lord. Professing Christians, even in these days, miser-like are hoarding up their money, and with iron grasp holding it from the service of Christ, while he is demanding it to aid in teaching a perishing world. Nor is the church more liberal and hearty in her prayers for this purpose. She comes not up in her united numbers, strong faith, and undeniable earnestness to God's throne of grace, to wrestle in the mightiest putting forth of her strength with the angel of the covenant, to enable her to comply to the fullest extent with her Lord's command. A few, only a few of her numbers are seen there; and even their prayers are so cold, and their wrestling so feeble and heartless, that their sincerity may be questioned, and consequently they cannot have power with God and prevail. And as for the heralds of the cross sent forth to preach the gospel, what are they? Not one for a thousand that might have been sent forth had there been a willing, anxious mind in that work—a self-sacrificing spirit to carry it forward; had the important commission of the Master been felt in all its magnitude and power. The church, the professed followers of Christ, and the ministry, have an awful burden of guilt upon their heads, as regards obedience to this command!

In the primitive ages of Christianity, the preachers of the gospel left all to fulfil this commission, and the converts to Christianity in some cases sold their possessions, and laid their price at the apostles' feet to aid in fulfilling this com-

mand. All this was done under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and consequently was right and acceptable in the sight of God. And if such was right, then it is difficult to see, even with all the reasons assigned to the contrary, why such doings, to carry out the commission of Christ, would not be right in the present day. One thing is certain, the church has not done her duty as regards this command, and consequently has an awful amount of guilt upon her head, for which she will be answerable at the coming of the Son of Man; for she has not acted like the disciples; she has not done her utmost to fulfil the commission of her Lord; and all the urgency that can be wrought into mighty argument to arouse her to the performance of this directly enjoined duty, signally fails.

III. *The result of obedience to this command: "He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned."*

It is not said, nor even hinted here, that when this commission is fulfilled to the greatest extent—that when the gospel is preached to all the nations of the earth—to the whole creation, that all and every individual will believe the gospel—believe in the Saviour whom it reveals, and be saved. No such idea is involved in the Lord's command, though some have imagined they have found it therein. But it no more implies the conversion of the whole world as the consequence of the preaching of the gospel, than it implies its non-conversion. It says not a word about the conversion of all mankind—the redemption of the whole world; the idea is not in the commission; it says not whether the preaching of the gospel among the nations, whenever it may be proclaimed, will convert many or few; but merely states the simple and solemn fact, "He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned."

Preaching the gospel, then, to all nations, to the whole world, does not necessarily secure, or even imply that all nations will believe the gospel—will receive Christ as their Saviour and King, and promptly and joyfully obey him. All men have never yet believed where the gospel has been preached; not even when Christ, and his disciples and apostles were the preachers. In the cities and countries where they preached, the hearers, to say nothing of the inhabitants,

did not all believe, nor a majority of them. "*Some believed, and some believed not.*" While some believed, more remained in unbelief. And so it has been, as regards the results of the preached gospel, from their day to the present. And were the ministers of the gospel increased to any conceivable number, and sent into every nation in obedience to this command, there is no positive nor even presumptive evidence that the result would be different—no evidence that all men would believe, and that in consequence of their universal belief, the latter-day glory in noontide effulgence would be ushered in. The experience of the past establishes something different from this: It teaches us, that while some believe others will not. Every increase of divine light, or religious revival, instead of shining more and more unto the perfect day, and progressing to the conversion of the whole world, in all ages, has been soon followed by an awful declension. The light of Eden, perfect and glorious, rapidly darkened after the fall, and the wickedness of men increased with hot-bed luxuriance till God in righteous judgment nearly destroyed the race by the flood. The purity of Noah, chosen by God to be the father of a purer race, was soon corrupted; and in a few generations his descendants became so wicked that they were all rejected, and Abraham chosen to be a holier father of a holier seed. But soon his descendants too degenerated, and sank into gross wickedness, as the mournful history of Israel shows, until they reached their climax in evil, in the rejection and crucifixion of the Son of God. Christ then by the ministry of the gospel introduced a better state of things, and greatly increased the power and purity of religion by a more abundant out-pouring of his Spirit. But even this highly superior state of religion from which might have been expected great and glorious results, even the conversion of the world, if it were to be accomplished in this way, instead of increasing more and more unto the perfect day, and bursting into millennial glory, soon began to decline, and in a few generations, degenerated into the superstitions and wickedness of the dark ages. Other revivals came, but not to increase till all the nations were converted to Christianity, but to decline and leave men as wicked and alienated from God as before. Judging then from analogy, or from the past, there is nothing to warrant

the expectation, that by the preaching of the gospel, as it is now preached, the whole world shall be evangelized, that the whole human family shall become holy, that the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ. The teaching of the past furnishes accumulated evidence against this view ; and Dr. Duff, who is doubtless well acquainted with religious statistics, says, notwithstanding all the efforts to propagate the gospel, or, as some would have it, to convert the world, "there are more heathen upon the earth now, than there were in the days of the Saviour."

Nor do the teachings of the Bible warrant the expectation that the world shall be converted by the present mode of preaching the gospel, but the contrary. It is not till the Son of Man sits upon the holy hill of Zion, that sacred mountain in Judea, "reigning before his ancients," or elders, "gloriously," that the uttermost parts of the earth are to be given to him for his possession, and the heathen to be dashed in pieces with a rod of iron and broken as a potter's vessel. It is not till the Son of Man comes, personally, visibly, gloriously with the clouds of heaven, as Daniel saw him in vision, "that dominion and glory, and a kingdom, are given to him ; and all nations and languages serve him." The horn of papacy makes war with the saints, and prevails against them, until the Ancient of days come personally to earth ; *then*, but not till *then*, judgment is given to the people of the saints of the Most High, and then the saints possess the kingdom—the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven. The tares and the wheat have to grow together till the time of the harvest ; but the time of the harvest is the coming of the Son of Man ; consequently the preaching of the gospel is not to uproot the tares and separate them from the wheat ; for that is the work of the Son of Man at his coming. The beast and the false prophet are to make war with the saints until the Word of God descend upon a white horse, and cast them alive into the lake of fire burning with brimstone. Satan is to be the god of this world, till the angel come down from heaven and bind him, and cast him into the bottomless pit.

All this then, and much more to which we cannot now advert, establishes the point that all nations are not to be

converted by the preaching of the gospel, nor the latter-day glory ushered in by such means. The Bible clearly teaches that that is the work of Christ at his personal return to earth, and that then he will perform the glorious work. He will then reveal himself to the people of Israel as their Shiloh, who will gladly receive him, and through them his saving health shall be made known to all nations.

But though the world is not to be converted by the preaching of the gospel, nor the millennial glory thus ushered in under the present dispensation; yet the gospel ought to be preached to all nations for a witness—for a testimony, and above all as the divinely appointed means for gathering God's elect people and church out of the world lying in wickedness, to himself. And the work which has such a noble and supremely important end to accomplish should be undertaken, and carried on with far greater zeal, and a more self-denying and self-sacrificing spirit than it is in these days. A mighty, self-consuming zeal, like that which burned with unquenchable fervor in the bosom and soul of Paul, should burn in the bosom of all the professing followers of Jesus Christ; and like him, not accounting their lives dear, they should come up to help in the divine work of preaching the gospel to every creature—of gathering God's people to himself from among the nations. The church, refreshed by prayer, and putting on new strength by a cordial consecration of herself, and all the means and influences she possesses, should come up in the greatness of her might to this divine work most solemnly enjoined by her Saviour. But the church-professing Christians, ministers of the gospel, possessing little of Paul's zeal, little of the Saviour's spirit, little of his love to perishing souls, and of his self-sacrificing desire for their salvation, can hear unmoved the long, loud, and withering wail, coming up from the people sitting in the shadow of death in heathen lands, and their shrieks of despair as they plunge into the lake of fire. The command of Christ, when leaving the earth, may sound in our ears in all its divine authority and power, "preach the gospel to all nations," and the bitter cry of perishing millions may mingle with its tones; but our hearts remain unmoved, we bestir not ourselves to do the work which

Christ requires—to teach the dying nations that they may believe in him and be saved.

IV. *The encouragement to fulfil this commission: "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world."*

Here Christ most solemnly promises his presence to the disciples when engaged in preaching the gospel in obedience to his command. They were not to go forth alone, nor in their own strength engage in a work so arduous; Christ promises to go with them and give them strength according to the magnitude of duty. If dangers beset them, threatening life at every step; if the dark clouds full of death's thunderbolts hung over them, they were not defencelessly exposed to these. His presence, his invisible, omnipotent power, was to be their all-protecting shield. If their labors were attended with little success, and only one here and there believed the story of the cross, they were not to be discouraged, for Jesus was with them, blessing and prospering them to the extent that it was his good pleasure they should be successful. Wherever they went, individually or collectively, Christ promised to them his presence; and having this ever accompanying them and abiding with them, they had divine encouragement and support in whatever situation they were placed.

Nor was Christ's presence peculiarly and exclusively promised to the disciples to whom he addresses these words; it is equally promised to all their successors in office. He did not say, I am with you to the end of your life, for that would have been limiting the promise to them; but I am with you to the end of the world. The word *αἰών*, our translators have mistranslated in every instance in the forty-one times they have rendered it *world*; for it does not mean this material world or earth, but duration, age, or dispensation, and ought to have been so translated; for *this world, or earth, is not to have an end, but endure for ever*. By the end, then, not of the world, but of the age or dispensation, we are to understand the end of the *present* gospel, or Christian dispensation, which in these days seems drawing nigh. Now, as the disciples to whom Christ addresses these words, would not, and did not live to the end of the Christian dispensation, which continues still, the pro-

mise made to them must also have been made to their successors in office—to the ministers of the gospel in all subsequent ages. What a comforting and sustaining assurance to the humble, devoted minister of Jesus Christ! It matters not whether he is performing the duties of his arduous office in the crowded city, where vice rages; or in his rural parish, where high-toned morality prevails; or amidst the superstitions of Greenland, or the dark idolatry of India; he has the assurance of his Lord and Master's presence—he can hear the promise from the throne of the Eternal, "Lo, I am with you."

*V.—The obligation to fulfil this commission: the command of Christ.*

It is not for us to ask before entering upon the fulfilment of this commission—If we preach the gospel to all nations, will all nations believe? or will very many, or will only a few of the nations believe?—and then act with zeal and energy, according to our judgment of probable results, according to our estimate of the number likely to be saved. The results, no matter whether great or small, form no part of the obligation, and should have no influence in determining us to the performance of the duty. It is the command of Christ, and that alone, that forms the whole burden of obligation, and that ought to be obeyed, without asking the question, whether many will believe and be saved?—whether indeed a single soul is converted or not. If it is his sovereign will that the gospel should be preached to all nations, as the command shows it is, then it is our duty to obey him, no matter whether all nations, or only a few of the nations, or only one individual should believe. As regards the results, as regards the number that shall believe and be saved, he has given us no information, because that is a matter with which we have nothing to do. Christ has pointed out the work, and commanded it to be done. His command is supreme and obligatory, and for this reason, and this alone, obedience is imperative upon us. Our duty is to obey—to labor to preach the gospel to all nations, leaving the result to him who has issued the command, and promised to make our labors successful to the extent of his good pleasure. When he says, "Go," our duty



is not to stand and ask questions about results, nor calculate results and act as these may seem favorable or unfavorable, great or small, but to move forward with the greatest earnestness and promptness of action, pressing all our powers of service into the divinely required work.

Let ministers of the gospel, let Christians hear this command from the ascended Saviour, and in obedience to it, let them arise promptly to the noble work, with prayer and enkindled zeal; let them consecrate all their powers and energies to the service, and go forth preaching the gospel in any way and every way they can, in the self-sacrificing spirit of the apostles, and of the Master himself, who laid down his life in the cause, in the full assurance of his ever-accompanying and abiding presence. "Go," is his command; "We go," ought to be their response and motto. If difficulties, dangers, persecutions, death, be in the way, still, like Christ, they should set their face as a flint, and press on in the work, assured of his presence; and that if they fall in the conflict, they shall be rewarded with a crown, a throne, and the inheritance with him of all things.

---

ART. V.—THE PLURALITY OF INHABITED WORLDS.

1. *The Plurality of Worlds.* Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1854.
2. *More Worlds than One. The Creed of the Philosopher, and the Hope of the Christian.* By Sir David Brewster, K.H., D.C.L. New York: R. Carter & Brothers, 1854.

BY THE EDITOR.

IT is a noticeable fact that almost all the principal branches of knowledge that have been zealously studied and largely advanced during the century, are made the ground by some of their cultivators, of an attack on Christianity. Thus, in the natural sciences, some of the leading doctrines of the current geology, zoology, and astronomy, are in open conflict with the teachings of the Scriptures, and are the reasons

which great numbers offer for their rejection of their inspiration and authority. The science of the mind is the medium of a still more direct and zealous assault on revealed religion—the most popular theories on the subject denying not merely the possibility of inspiration, but of a knowledge of God through any channel whatever, and inculcating a blank and hopeless atheism. Physiology, the diversities of the form and color of the human race, language, archæology, history, are in like manner presented by their devotees, in a hostile attitude to the Bible, and all the resources of learning and ingenuity are exhausted to divest it through them of its sacred character, and deprive it of its hold on the faith and reverence of men. The first of the works—the titles of which are placed at the head of this article—deceptively named the *Plurality of Worlds*, is, in a measure at least, of this class. The author's object is to show, not that there are many worlds that are the residence of intelligent beings, but that there are not; that the earth is the only one that is the scene of a moral government, and that man is the only species of rational creatures; that the universe, therefore, is substantially a mere physical empire, and the great ends, consequently, pursued by God, of a mere material, instead of a moral nature. The reader is thence left to draw the inevitable inference, that the views given in the Bible, and generally entertained by the church, of God's empire and government, are essentially false, and must be rejected for a vague, unsentimental, and unauthoritative natural religion, or no religion at all.

He wishes, indeed, a quite different judgment to be formed of his object. He represents that many who are thoughtful, and even religiously inclined, are led, by the extreme insignificance of the earth, compared to the vastness of the material universe, to doubt that God exercises any moral government over this world, or takes any special care of man. With such boundless realms to occupy his attention, they think it incredible, he says, that the Creator should stoop to bestow any special notice on man; and he exhibits it as his aim to meet this objection by showing that this world is the only one in which intelligences reside, and men the only order of rational and moral creatures; and therefore, that the faint and scarcely demonstrable regard with which God dis-

tinguishes them, according to his low notions of natural religion, is not incredible nor improbable.

The mode in which he presents the subject is seen from the following passage:—

“Perhaps we shall make our reasonings and speculations apply to a wider class of readers, if we consider the view now spoken of, not as an objection urged by an *opponent* of religion, but rather as a difficulty felt by a *friend* of religion. It is, I *conceive*, certain that many of those not at all disposed to argue against religion, but who, on the contrary, feel that their whole internal comfort and repose are bound up indissolubly with their religious convictions, are still troubled and dismayed at the doctrines of the vastness of the universe, and the multitude of worlds which they suppose to be taught and proved by astronomy. They have a profound reverence for *THE IDEA of God*. They are glad to acknowledge their constant and universal dependence upon his preserving power and goodness; they are ready and desirous to recognise the working of his providence; they receive the moral law as his law, with reverence and submission; they regard their transgressions of this law as sins against him, and are eager to find the mode of reconciliation to him, when thus estranged from him; they willingly think of God as near to them. But while they listen to the evidence which science . . . sets before them, of the long array of groups, and hosts, and myriads of worlds, which are brought to our knowledge, they find themselves perturbed and distressed. They would willingly think of God as *near* to them; but during the progress of this enumeration, he appears at every step to be removed *further and further from them*. To discover that the earth is so large, the number of its inhabitants so great, its form so different from what man at first imagines it, may, perhaps, have startled them; but in this view there is nothing which a pious mind does not easily surmount. But if Venus and Mars also have their inhabitants; if Saturn and Jupiter—globes so much larger than the earth—have a proportional amount of population, *may not man be neglected or overlooked? Is he worthy to be regarded by the Creator of all?* May not, must not the most pious mind recur to the exclamation of the Psalmist, ‘Lord, what is man that thou art mindful of him?’ And must not this exclamation, under the new aspect of things, be accompanied by an enfeebled and less confident belief that God *is* mindful of him? And then this array of planets, which derive their light from the sun, extends much further than even the astronomer at first suspected. The orbit of Saturn is ten times as wide as the orbit of the earth: but beyond Saturn, and at-

most twice as far from the sun, Herschel discovers Uranus, another great planet; and again, beyond Uranus, and again at nearly twice his distance, the subtle sagacity of the astronomers of our day surmises and then detects another great planet. In such a system as this, the earth shrinks into insignificance. *Can its concerns engage the attention of him who made the whole?* But, again, this whole solar system itself, with all its orbits and planets, shrinks into a mere point, when compared with the nearest fixed star. And again, the distance which lies between us and such stars shrinks into incalculable smallness, when we journey in thought to other fixed stars. And again and again, the scene of our previous contemplation suffers an immeasurable contraction, as we pass on to other points of view.

"And in all these successive moves, we are still within the dominions of the same Creator and Governor, and at every move we are brought, we may suppose, to new bodies of his subjects, bearing, in the expansion of their number, some proportion to the expanse of space which they occupy. And if this be so, how shall the earth, and men, its inhabitants, thus repeatedly *annihilated*, as it were, by the growing magnitude of the known universe, *continue to be anything in the regard* of him who embraces all? Last of all, how shall men continue to receive that special, persevering, providential, judicial, personal care, which religion implies; and without the belief of which, any man who has religious thoughts, must be disturbed and unhappy, desolate and forsaken?"—Pp. 37–39.

The doubts which he here proposes are thus not those of believers in revealed religion; they are not the doubts even of common theists, who reject revelation. Instead, they are founded, as we shall see, on a disbelief either of God's ability or disposition to take care of the works he has called into existence. For what parties are there who, believing in the existence of God, yet question, for the reasons he here presents, that the Most High exercises a peculiar care over this world, and over men? He does not name any who, on that ground, doubt the reality of his providence and moral government. Ordinary deists do not. They admit and assert his government, and maintain that natural religion is of such clearness and authority, that a miraculous revelation is unnecessary and improbable.

The class for whom he writes, therefore, if there be any such, must be of a very low order of religionists; they must

be not only rejecters of revelation, but far below common deists in their notions both of God and man. The scruples which he entertains, if they are sincere, are probably peculiar to himself, and, at most, to such as hold the geological and astronomical theories which are the chief basis of his speculations respecting the material and moral universe, and whether truly felt or not, their natural tendency is—and there is much that indicates that that is their real design—to drive religion out of the world, or to reduce it to so low a point as to divest it of all title to consideration.

That notwithstanding some seeming, though very vague and equivocal recognitions of Christianity, he in effect rejects revelation, is apparent from the assumption on which he proceeds in the foregoing passage. He alleges the vastness of God's empire, as a proof that he cannot and does not give immediate and special attention to so small a world as the earth and so insignificant a race as men; and he holds that the likelihood and certainty that men are not the objects of God's providential and moral care, increases just in proportion to the immensity of his material kingdom compared to the slightness of the earth. This is the whole ground of his alleged difficulty. But in this he plainly proceeds on a conviction either that God is unable, or else is indisposed to exercise a continual and minute care of all his works. For if he is omnipotent, all-knowing, and all-wise, and can as easily exercise a perfect providence and moral administration over myriads and millions of worlds, and of races and orders of intelligences, as over one, why should the greatness of his empire be alleged as a proof that he does not and cannot exercise such a sway over the earth and its population? And if he has the requisite natural attributes, and is infinitely regardful of his rights, and infinitely regardful also of the rights and well-being of his creatures; and if his own rectitude requires that he should rule the worlds and the beings he calls into existence and upholds, how can their multiplicity be regarded as a proof that he does not? As his own righteousness and thence his blessedness requires that he should treat all his subjects according to their nature, it is clear that the greatness of their number is a reason that he should exercise a perfectly wise and benevolent government over them; not that he should neglect and refuse it. This writer

builds his whole speculation, therefore, manifestly either on a denial of God's natural or moral perfections, or else on a total ignorance and misconception of the course which his perfections require that he should pursue as the Creator, Upholder, and Ruler of the universe. He cannot make the infinite power, intelligence, and goodness of God the ground of the inference which he draws against his exercising a government over any part of his works; for if God has those infinite attributes, they not only render him competent to such a government, but are positive reasons that he should exercise it, and present a moral certainty that he does and will. An inadequacy to the infinite task, or a moral indisposition to it, are the only grounds from which it can be logically inferred that he does not exercise such a sway. Let this writer admit on the one hand, that God has all the natural attributes, power, knowledge, and skill that are requisite to the government of his kingdom; and let him concede on the other, that righteousness and benevolence make it indispensable that if he calls moral creatures into existence, he should treat them according to their peculiar nature, and that that requires that he should place them under a moral government, hold them accountable for their conduct, and therefore judge and reward them; and the whole ground of his difficulty, the whole basis of his speculations will vanish from beneath him.

The postulate, therefore, from which he starts is not that of a Christian believer; it is not that of an ordinary deist; it is not that even of a theist, who regards God as almighty, all-intelligent, and infinitely righteous. It is the postulate of one who does not conceive of God as of infinite perfections, but who thinks the deity is essentially like himself, immeasurably imperfect, without a consistent scheme of administration, fluctuating in his purposes, and with neither the rectitude, the benevolence, nor the skill that are necessary to the station he occupies. The method by which he attempts to tranquillize the fears, and soothe the disquietudes of the religious for whom he professes to write, is accordingly an extraordinary one. It is not by proving that God is able to, and from the perfections of his nature must, take a watchful care of them by a ceaseless providence, and a holy and benevolent moral government; but by teaching them that he

either *cannot*, because he has not the necessary power and intelligence; or else that he *does not*, because he has not the rectitude and benevolence which it demands! A brilliant exploit truly for a Christian philosopher! Exquisite consolation for those who are troubled and despairing under the apprehension that God is not caring properly for their present and future well-being!

He indicates the same low and unworthy views of God in alleging it as a further proof that no other world than the earth is inhabited by intelligent beings; that if there are other orders of rational creatures they must be "progressive" like men, or must gain their knowledge, and make whatever advancement they may in culture, gradually; as though the fact that it must necessarily be so with finite beings, who at the commencement of their existence are totally ignorant, and whose ideas take place in succession, is a proof that no such beings are created; that is, the fact, that a finite and dependent nature cannot act according to the attributes of an infinite and self-existent one, is a proof that no finite minds are called into existence! Thus he says:

"The view we have given of the mode of existence of the human species upon the earth, as being a progressive existence, even in the development of the intellectual powers and their results, necessarily fastens down our thoughts and our speculations to the earth, and makes us feel how visionary and gratuitous it is to assume any similar kind of existence in any region occupied by other beings than man. As we have said, we have no insuperable difficulty in conceiving other parts of the universe to be tenanted by animals. Animal life implies no progress in the species. Such as they are in one century, such are they in another. The conditions of their sustentation and generation being given, which no difference in physical circumstances can render incredible, the race may, so far as we can see, go on for ever. But a race which makes a progress in the development of its faculties cannot thus, or at least cannot with the same ease, be conceived as existing through all time and under all circumstances. Progress implies, or at least suggests, a beginning and an end. If the mere existence of a race imply a sustaining and preserving power in the Creator, the progress of a race implies a *guiding and impelling power*; a *Governor and Director*, as well as a *Creator and Preserver*. And progress not merely in material conditions, not merely in the exercise of bodily faculties, but in the exer-

cise of mental faculties, in the intellectual condition of a portion of the species, still more implies a special position and character of the race, which cannot, without great licence of hypothesis, be extended to other races, and which, if so extended, becomes unmeaning, from the impossibility of our knowing what is progress in any other species—from what and towards what it tends. The intellectual progress of the human species has been a progress in the use of thought, and in the knowledge which such use procures; it has been a progress from mere matter to mind; from the impressions of sense to ideas; from what in knowledge is casual, partial, temporary, to what is necessary, universal, and eternal. We can conceive no progress of the nature of this, which is not identical with this; nothing like it which is not the same. And, therefore, if we will people other planets with creatures, intelligent as man is intelligent, we must not only give to them the intelligence but the intellectual history of the human species. They must have had their minds unfolded by steps similar to those by which the human mind has been unfolded; or at least differing from them only as the intellectual history of one nation of the earth differs from that of another. They must have had their Pythagoras, their Plato, their Kepler, their Galileo, their Newton, if they know what we know."

"Thus the condition of man upon the earth, as a condition of intellectual progress, implies such a special guidance and government exercised over the race by the author of his being as produces progress; and we have not, so far as we yet perceive, any reason for supposing that he exercises a like guidance and government over any of the other bodies with which the researches of astronomers have made us acquainted."

"Now when we have arrived at this result, we have, I conceive, reached one of the points at which the difficulties which astronomical discovery puts in the way of religious conviction begin to appear. The earth and its human inhabitants are, as far as we yet know, in an especial manner the subjects of God's care and government, for the race is *progressive*. Now, can this be? Is it not difficult to believe that it is so? The earth, so small a speck, only one among so many, so many thousands, so many millions of other bodies, all probably of the same nature with itself, wherefore should it draw to it *the special regards* of the Creator of all, and occupy his care in an especial manner?"—Pp. 55–58.

Here again, as in the former instance, his doubt of the existence of other moral beings than men, is founded on a denial or distrust of the divine perfections. For he alleges it as



the main ground of his difficulty in believing that other worlds are peopled by moral creatures, that man is progressive in the evolution of his faculties and the acquisition of his knowledge, and that other orders of intelligent beings, if there are any, must also be *progressive* in the evolution of theirs, or at least in the acquisition of scientific, religious, and other knowledge; and must, therefore, as man is, be the objects of a special care. But this he thinks is scarcely credible. He can believe that God can create and uphold the crowd of worlds that occupy the vast domain of space. He has no difficulty in conceiving the whole "universe to be tenanted by animals," because "animal life implies no progress in the species." But "a race which makes progress in the development of its faculties, cannot thus be conceived," he thinks, "as existing through all time and under all circumstances," and because it must be "progressive," and must require "a special guidance and government" by its "author."

But why should the fact that intelligent creatures must necessarily be finite, must think, therefore, of the subjects of their thoughts successively, in place of grasping them contemporaneously as the Omniscient does, and must thence be progressive in their knowledge, be any obstacle to God's creating and governing such creatures, unless there is some inadequacy in his nature to such a work, or some indisposition to it in his feelings? If he has all the power and wisdom, and all the righteousness and benevolence that are necessary to it, then the fact that it would require the exercise of those faculties can be no obstacle to his undertaking and accomplishing it. To assume from the fact that a being is infinitely competent to a great and glorious work, that he cannot undertake and achieve it, is very extraordinary logic. This writer, therefore, builds his denial that God has any other moral creatures than man, on a tacit doubt of his adequacy to the task of ruling them. There is no other postulate from which his inference can be deduced. He conceives of him as incapable of exercising a moral government over other races of intelligent creatures, either because he has not the requisite power for it, or else because he has not the wisdom, righteousness, and benevolence which it requires. The ground on which he stands in this argument, therefore, as in

the preceding, is not that of a believer in revelation, nor of a consistent deist, but that of a shallow and ignorant speculatist who conceives of God as weak and imperfect like himself.

But in this reasoning he confounds himself again as he did before; for if the fact that moral creatures are finite, and must be progressive in the culture of their faculties and acquisition of knowledge, is a proof that God cannot have created such beings, then it proves as conclusively that he has not created man on the earth, as it does that he has not called similar beings into existence on Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn; and the whole problem he is attempting to solve is a fiction and delusion, instead of a reality. How much to be regretted is it that this writer, who is so sharp in seeing imaginary difficulties, had not cast a momentary glance in this direction at so real a one! It would have saved him the trouble of rearing a large part of the stately fabric which he here so summarily dashes to the earth.

That he occupies the ground of a sceptic instead of a believer in revelation, is seen also from his offering it as a further proof that there are no other moral creatures than men; that if there are—if the worlds generally are supposed to be peopled by intelligent creatures, they must still be held to be of identically the same nature, character, and condition as men. He asserts this in a great number of passages, with the most undoubting assurance, and makes it one of the chief grounds of his reasoning and declamation against the existence of other orders of intelligences. Thus he says:

“ Here then again we are brought to the conviction that God is, so far as we yet see, in an especial and peculiar manner, the Governor of the earth and of its human inhabitants, in such a way that the like government *cannot be conceived* to be extended to other planets and other systems, without arbitrary and fanciful assumptions; assumptions either of unintelligible differences with incomprehensible results, *or of beings in all respects human*, inhabiting the most remote regions of the universe. And here again, therefore, we are led to the same difficulty which we have already encountered. Can the earth, a small globe among so many millions, have been selected as the scene of this especially divine government?

“ That when we attempt to extend our sympathies to the inhabitants of other planets and other worlds, and to regard them as living, like us, under a moral government, we are driven to suppose them

to be, in all essential respects, human beings like ourselves, we have proof, in all the attempts which have been made with whatever licence of hypothesis and fancy, to present to us descriptions and representations of other parts of the universe. Such representations, though purposely made as unlike human beings as the imagination of man can form them, still are merely combinations, slightly varied, of the elements of human being; and thus show us that not only our reason, but even our imagination, cannot conceive creatures subjected to the same government to which man is subjected, without conceiving them as being men of one kind or other."—Pp. 60, 61.

This representation, however, if true, would contribute nothing to his object, for if it were a fact that we cannot conceive of any other order of intelligences than men, that would form no proof or probability that God cannot, and has not *created* other orders of intelligences. How does it follow from such a limitation of *our* powers of conception and fancy as he asserts, that there must be an equal limitation of God's powers, or of his agency! Singular logic, truly, for a philosopher who deems himself to have reached a height of intelligence so far above that of his fellow men generally, that he is competent to confute one of the most undoubting of the beliefs which they entertain!

But if he is not a disbeliever in the divine origin and authority of the Sacred Scriptures, how is it that he advances this false and absurd proposition? Are not angels to whom God directly reveals himself, who act as his messengers, who are capable of coming from his presence to this world, and of returning, who are naturally invisible to us, but who are able to make themselves perceptible, a different order of intelligences from men? Were not the Seraphim, the burning spirits who stood above the throne of Jehovah, Isaiah vi. 2, 3, having six wings, of a different nature from men? This writer surely, in effect at least, rejects the authority of the Bible, or he would not, in the face of the fact it thus reveals, assert that there can be no intelligences of a different order from men, nor of any other world than this.

And his denial that there either are, or can be any other species of intelligences than men, is founded, like his other assumptions, on a tacit denial of the divine perfections. For on what ground can he maintain that there can be no

other class of moral creatures than such as men, unless it be on the assumption that God is not able to create any other? If God is as able to create intelligences of other species, as he is to create human beings, then plainly nothing in his nature makes it certain that he has not created them of other species; and with equal certainty nothing in the nature of man makes it clear that other species have not been created by him. Each of the grounds on which he thus far proceeds, thus resolves itself into low, false, and impious notions of the divine Being, that are utterly alien from the Christian belief:—into a bold denial of his perfections, and adequacy to his station as the Creator, Upholder, and Ruler of the universe.

The whole tendency of his work, accordingly, and probably its aim, unless he is ignorant of the real import of his principles to a degree that is scarcely credible, is to discredit the views which the Scriptures give of the attributes and character of the Creator, the nature of the empire he has called into existence, and the government he is exercising over it, and substitute in their place, the meanest, the falsest, and the most contemptible form of theism that has ever been devised. Yet this audacious speculatist, who exhausts all the resources of his learning, wit, and disingenuousness, to throw discredit on the Jehovah of the Bible,<sup>5</sup> and its teachings respecting his kingdom and his government, is welcomed by Dr. Hitchcock in an introduction to the volume, as a "Christian scholar," who employs himself in illustrating religion from science; and an unreserved sanction is given both to the main principles on which he proceeds, and the chief conclusions he draws respecting the condition of the worlds that make up the universe.

Having thus laid the foundation of his theory of the universe on these false and antitheistic postulates, he then proceeds to confirm it by considerations drawn from the doctrines of geology, respecting the formation of the strata and the age of the world; and from the nebular hypothesis respecting the origin of stars and planetary systems. Nearly the whole of his reasonings are founded on those false, unscientific, and preposterous systems, and are dependent on their truth for their speciousness and force. He manages them, however, especially those drawn from geology, with much adroitness and success. He holds that the doctrines of modern

speculative geology respecting the immeasurable age of the earth and the processes by which its strata were formed, are scientifically demonstrated, and are as proper data to reason from as the facts of astronomy are; and if his data are admitted, it will not be easy, we think, to set aside his conclusion; namely, that on the ground of that system, there are no decisive proofs that any other planet than the earth, or indeed any other world, is inhabited by rational creatures. Dr. Hitchcock admitting and asserting the geological postulates on which he proceeds, is undoubtedly obliged, unless he deserts his principles, to accede as he does to his conclusion. The postulates, however, are false, and the argument unscientific; and if it were not, it is, in our judgment, directed as much against revealed religion and its author, and is as effective in that relation, as it is against the doctrine of the existence of other inhabited worlds than ours.

Sir D. Brewster's volume is in the main an able and pleasing answer to the author of the *Plurality of Worlds*. He employs himself chiefly in describing the solar and stellar systems, and pointing out the indications which they present, that they are designed to be the residences of intelligent beings. He seems to us, however, to have embarrassed himself very much, by conceding to his antagonist the geological postulates from which he reasons, that the earth existed through an immense and unknown period anterior to the creation of man. He does indeed, in his third chapter, decline to receive the assumptions and conclusions of geology respecting the formation and age of the earth, as certainties scientifically demonstrated, and pronounces them mere hypotheses. He says,

"Geology does not pretend to give us any information respecting the process by which the nucleus of the earth was formed. Some speculative astronomers, indeed, have presumptuously embarked in such an inquiry; but there is not a trace of evidence that the solid nucleus of the globe was formed by secondary causes, such as the aggregation of attenuated matter diffused through space; and the *nebular theory*, as it has been called, though maintained by a few distinguished names, has, we think, been overturned by arguments that have never been answered.

"As all the stratified formations which compose the crust of the earth have obviously been deposited in succession, geologists have

endeavored to form some notion of the time occupied in their deposition, or the age of the most ancient of them. By studying the fossil remains found in the different formations, geologists have placed it beyond a doubt, that great changes have taken place during the formation of the crust of the earth. The plants and animals which existed in one period, are not found in another; new species were at different times created; and frequent convulsions have taken place, upheaving the beds of the ocean into continents and mountain ranges, and covering the dry land with the waters which were displaced. That the deposition of strata of such thickness, and operations of such magnitude, required a long period of time for their accomplishment, has been willingly conceded to the geologist; *but this concession has been founded on the adoption of a UNIT of measure, which may or may not be correct. It is taken for granted that many of the stratified rocks were deposited in the sea by THE SAME SLOW PROCESSES which are going on in the present day; and as the thickness of the deposits now produced is a very small quantity during a long period of time, it is inferred that NINE OR TEN MILES OF STRATA must have taken MILLIONS OF YEARS FOR THEIR FORMATION.*

"We are not disposed to grudge the geologist even periods so marvellous as this, *provided they are considered AS MERELY HYPOTHETICAL*; but when we find, as we shall presently do, that speculative writers employ these assumed periods AS POSITIVE TRUTHS for establishing other theories, which we consider erroneous and even dangerous, we are compelled to examine, more minutely, a chronology which has been thus misapplied.

"Although we may admit that our seas and continents have nearly the same locality, and cover nearly the same area, as they did at the creation of Adam; and that the hills have not, since that time, changed their form or their height, nor the beds of the ocean become deeper or shallower from the diurnal changes going on around us; *yet this does not authorize us to conclude that the world was prepared for man by similar causes operating in a similar manner.* The same physical causes may operate quickly or slowly. The dew may fall invisibly on the ground—the gentle shower may descend noiselessly on the grass—or the watery vapor may rush down in showers and torrents of rain, destroying animal and vegetable life. The frozen moisture may fall in atoms of crystal, which are felt only by the tender skin upon which they light; or it may come down in flakes of snow, forming beds many feet in thickness, or it may be precipitated in destructive hailstones, or in masses of ice, which crush everything upon which they fall.

"When the earth was completed as the home of the human family, violent changes upon its surface were incompatible with the security of life, and the progress of civilization. The powers of the physical world were, therefore, put under restraint, when man obtained dominion over the earth; and after the great catastrophe which destroyed almost every living thing, the 'bow was set in the clouds'—a covenant between God and man that the elements should not again be his destroyer. If the Almighty, then, since the creation of man, 'broke up the fountains of the deep, and opened the windows of heaven,' and thus, by apparently natural causes, covered the whole earth with an ocean that rose above the Himalaya and the Andes, why may he not at different periods, or during the whole course of the earth's formation, have deposited its strata by a rapid precipitation of their atoms from the waters which suspended them! *The period of the earth's formation would, upon this principle, be reduced to little more than the united generations of the different orders of plants and animals which constitute its organic remains. But even the period thus computed from the supposed duration of animal life, may be still further shortened. Plants and animals which, in our day, require a century for their development, may in primitive times have shot up in rank luxuriance, and been ready in a few days, or months, or years, for the great purpose of exhibiting, by their geological distribution, the progressive formation of the earth.*

"There are other points in geological theory, which, though mere inferences from a very limited number of facts, have been employed, *as if they were absolutely true*, to support erroneous and dangerous theories; and but for this misapplication of them, we should not have called in question opinions in themselves reasonable only when viewed *as probable truths*. The geological inference to which we allude is, *that man did not exist during the period of the earth's formation.*"—Pp. 45-53.

Here is thus a specific rejection of the postulate on which the geological theory of the vast age of the earth is founded, that the processes by which the strata were formed took place under the action of causes of only the same intensity, and operating at the same slow rate, as those by which somewhat similar effects are wrought at the present time. This he pronounces a mere hypothesis—not a self-evident, or a demonstrated certainty from which the immense age ascribed by geologists to the earth can be scientifically established. Instead, he maintains that it is compatible with the powers and the laws of nature, that the whole body of the strata

should have been deposited in a very brief period. The pretext, therefore, that geology establishes the slow formation of the strata, and the immense age of the world, by scientific proof, he rejects as a great and dangerous error. These are substantially the views, our readers will see, which we have maintained, and they overthrow the pretence so loudly proclaimed by some of the geologists, that their theory of the age of the earth is a fact scientifically established, and overturn the whole of the reasonings of the author of the *Plurality of Worlds*, founded on that theory, in support of his doctrine that the earth is the only sphere that is inhabited by intelligent creatures.

Very inconsiderately, however, we think, Sir D. Brewster quits this ground, and consents to reason with his antagonist on the supposition that that geological hypothesis is true; for he thereby gives up the means of proving that the planets are already the residence of intelligent creatures, which is the point to which all his other reasonings are directed, and which it is his proper business to establish, and only retains the power of proving that they *may, at some future time*, become the seats of rational existence. He says:—

“The first and the most plausible of the arguments maintained by the essayist, is drawn from geological facts and theories. We have already, in a preceding chapter, explained these facts, and admitted, *with certain limitations* (which, to give our opponent every advantage, we at present abandon), that during a long period of time, when the earth was preparing for the residence of man, it was the seat only of vegetable and animal life.

“Since the earth, then, was, during a very long time (a *million of years* we shall say) uninhabited by intelligent beings, our author draws the conclusion that all *the other planets may be occupied at present with a life no higher than that of brutes, or with no life at all*; that is, that there is not a plurality of worlds inhabited by rational beings. Now, this is not the conclusion which the premises authorize. If God took a million of years to prepare the earth for man, the probability is, that all the planets were similarly prepared for inhabitants, and that they are *now* occupied by rational beings. If one or more of them are only *in the act of being prepared*, and are not yet the seat of intelligence, analogy forces us to the conclusion that they will be inhabited like the earth. The assertion that



they may be occupied by *no life at all*, is contrary to all analogy, unless we suppose that all the planets are only in that stage of preparation which preceded the *protozoic* age—a supposition which no person is entitled to make, but which, if it were true, would prove that the time was approaching when all the planets would be inhabited like the earth.”—Pp. 205–207.

But in thus conceding that the earth existed, and was the seat of life through a vast and unknown series of ages before man was created, he gives up, so far as the argument from this world is concerned, all *certainty* that any of the other planets are the seats of rational existence. The term million, he uses “to avoid circumlocution,”—not as the real measure of the period that was occupied in the preparation of the earth for the residence of man. He concedes that on the geological theory, it may have been, as many maintain, many millions of years. There are no means of determining, or conjecturing with any color of probability within myriads and millions of ages, what the period must have been. In admitting, therefore, that it is thus wholly uncertain what length of time must pass from the creation of a planet before, judging from the supposed analogy of the earth according to the hypothesis of geologists, it can be prepared to be the residence of intelligent existences; he admits that it is impossible to show that any of the planets have existed during such a period as is necessary for their preparation to be the abode of such existences. All that his argument enables him, on the supposition that it is legitimate, to prove is, that though they “are not yet the seat of intelligence, analogy forces us to the conclusion that they *will* be inhabited like the earth.” He thus allows the essayist to triumph so far as the present state of planetary worlds is concerned. But if it is conceded that so far as analogy goes, there is no proof nor probability that up to the present time any other planet than the earth is inhabited by rational creatures; it is, then, a very grave question whether any proofs or probabilities are furnished by analogy that any other planet ever will be inhabited by them. For if all the planetary worlds except the earth have, through the lapse of untold myriads and millions of ages, been devoted exclusively to animal and vegetable life, does not analogy indi-

cate, and on a scale proportional to the greatness of those worlds in number and bulk compared to the earth, that they are to be for ever devoted exclusively to animal and vegetable life? Is not every such planet as ample a premise, in proportion to its size, for that conclusion, as the earth is for the opposite one? If the argument depends for its force on what has actually taken place, does it not conclude with infinitely greater force against the inhabitation of any other planet than the earth by rational creatures, than in favor of it? Can it be proved, or made in any measure probable, that such immeasurable periods are requisite to the preparation of planets for the abode of intelligent beings? Does not the supposition that they are devoted through immeasurable ages to unintelligent life, indicate that the processes through which they pass during those periods, have a reference to that life, rather than to prepare them for the residence of intelligent creatures? If the latter is the aim of the changes through which they are conducted, why are they protracted through such immense periods, when they might be consummated in a comparatively brief space? We see not how Sir D. Brewster can answer these inquiries. He seems to us most needlessly and unscientifically to have conceded to his antagonist a postulate from which, on the one hand, the inference against the occupation of the planets by intelligent beings up to the present time, is made unanswerable; and on the other, the sinews are cut of the argument from analogy, in favor of their becoming the residence of such beings at any future period.

Into the theme of his seventh chapter, the religious difficulties of the subject, which is less happily treated than the main branches of his argument, we have not space to enter. The confident assumption of his opponent, that if other worlds besides the earth are inhabited by rational creatures, they must be fallen and miserable like men, we regard as wholly unauthorized and absurd. He might as well allege the fact that the inmates of a hospital are all diseased, many of them broken-limbed, and some of them mutilated, as proof that the inmates of all other large edifices are in the same bodily condition; or the fact that the patients in an insane retreat are delirious, as proof that the occupants of all other spacious buildings are bereft of reason. Aliena-

tion—revolt from God—is not a natural condition of creatures, any more than fever, the fracture and dislocation of the limbs, and delirium, are natural to the body and mind. Both are unnatural, the result of peculiar causes, and their existence in this world cannot be made the ground of inferring that they are common to other orders of intelligences.

The fancy of the essayist and other sceptics, that the insignificance of this world compared to the countless multitude of orbs that fill the regions of space, renders it incredible that this sphere should be made the theatre of so astonishing a work as that of redemption, is equally unfounded and irrational. Instead, it is a mark of the infinite wisdom and benevolence of God that in admitting evil to enter his kingdom, and in a race that multiply and transmit the evils of their fallen state to their offspring, he selected a world of such moderate dimensions. As evil takes place, not because he cannot prevent it, but by his permission, because the display and vindication of his rights and character, and the ultimate well-being of his kingdom will be better subserved by permitting than by preventing it, through the moral administration he exercises towards those who sin; his perfections must naturally lead him to confine it to as narrow limits as are compatible with his securing the great objects for which it is allowed to take place; and these objects manifestly are the perfect exhibition and assertion of his right to the homage of all his moral creatures; his right to subject them to a trial of their allegiance that shall justify him in treating them, if they continue obedient, as his steadfast and trustworthy children; and his right to punish them for their offences; the exemplification of the natural consequences of revolt in the continued sin and misery of the fallen; the exemplification of the hopelessness of their ever voluntarily returning to allegiance; the demonstration of his power to treat fallen beings, even in punishing them, with perfect justice and goodness; and finally the manifestation of his ability to renew, forgive, and redeem the revolted, and raise them to the purity and blessedness of unfallen children, consistently with truth, justice, goodness, and wisdom, and to the infinite glory of his name and benefit of his kingdom. And all these demonstrations are made, all will admit, on an ade-

quate scale for the instruction of the whole universe, no matter how countless the orders, or immense the number of the intelligences may be that people it. No one surely will maintain that there has not been, and is not to be, an adequate exemplification of what it is for a race of moral beings to revolt from God; what the forms are which sin assumes in such a world, and what the miseries are to which it gives birth. No one will maintain that this world has not proved an ample theatre for the assertion of God's rights over fallen creatures, and the exemplification of them in acts of judgment and justice. No one will object that it has not proved an ample scene for the display of his forbearance, his pity, his condescension, his bounty, and his goodness. No one will deny that in the work of redemption, a manifestation is made of his righteousness and his mercy, in a form and on a scale suitable to the grandeur of his being and attributes, and commensurate to the display of these infinite glories of his nature to all the countless hosts of his empire through the endless ages of its existence. Nor will any one deny that the Scriptures foreshow that the application of redemption to the race is hereafter to take place on a far vaster scale than heretofore, continue through an immense period, and rise to a greatness and grandeur equal to all the ends it is designed to answer in his kingdom throughout its everlasting career. As then all these great aims are to be adequately attained, our earth is of sufficient size for the theatre of such a work, and its selection in preference to a vaster orb that would naturally have involved the everlasting loss of far greater numbers, is precisely what might be expected of God's perfections, and is a proof, instead of otherwise, that the work of redemption is truly his.

Sir David Brewster's chapters on the sun, planets, and stars, are very pleasing, and present the argument for a plurality of inhabited worlds in an effective form. It may be briefly stated thus. The earth is fitted to be the abode of living things, vegetables, and animals, by its solid crust, its water, and its air, its whirl on its axis, its movement round the sun by which it has a succession of seasons, and its illumination by that orb and the moon. And these elements, agents, and movements, with the vegetables and animals with which it is peopled, fit it to be the abode of man; for

the latter are as essential to his residence here, as soil, air, water, light, and heat are, and have in their subservience to him the end of their being. Vegetables are unquestionably designed for the support of animal life, and are indispensable to the subsistence of corporeal intelligences like men; and animals are as unquestionably necessary in a world sown with vegetables, and are designed for the service of intelligences, even if not in the shape of food; as is shown by their creation on the earth immediately after the production of vegetables, and the subjection of both to the dominion of man. Such are the facts in respect to the earth. If it were not the abode of man, the reason would be wanting for which its vegetables and animals now have their being; and if there were no vegetables and animals on it, the object would no longer exist for which it has a soil, water, and air, turns on its axis, revolves round the sun, and receives from that orb light and heat. As these elements, agents, and movements thus have their end in vegetable, animal, and human life, it is clear that they exist for that end; a subserviency to vegetable, animal, and rational life is their proper and special function. Such then being the fact in respect to the earth, in reasoning from that to other planets, we must regard the same elements, movements, and agents wherever we discover them, as having the same function and operating to the same end. The fact, therefore, that Mars and Jupiter, for example, have solid crusts, water, and air, that they turn on their axes, and revolve round the sun, are illuminated and warmed by that orb, have a succession of days and seasons, and that Jupiter has a group of splendid moons, shows that they are fitted to be the theatre of vegetable and animal life; and as vegetables and animals have their end in subserving the well-being of intelligent creatures, they together indicate that those orbs are the residences of intelligent existences. The fact that these causes and auxiliaries of intelligent life exist in those spheres, is thus a natural and adequate postulate for the inference that intelligent beings exist there, in subserving whom these causes and instruments have their end. To deny it, is to deny that we can reason from our world to others. For if this is not a legitimate argument from the facts of our world, it is clear that there can be no argument of any kind from them. If that which is

true here does not hold true there; if the existence of the like causes and agencies there does not indicate that they exist for the like purposes as here, and have their subservience in the like ends, then undoubtedly, as they certainly cannot prove the opposite, nor any different fact, they form no ground for any inference whatever, and all analogical reasoning from them must be given up, which is irrational and absurd. A like argument is applicable to all other planets, and indeed to all other spheres.

Sir David Brewster sums up his argument on this branch of the subject in the following form :

" We can easily conceive why some persons may believe that all the planets which have satellites are inhabited, while they deny the inhabitability of those that have none, and also of the sun and the satellites themselves. There are individuals, too, though we doubt their faith in siderial astronomy, who readily believe that the whole of our planetary system is the seat of life, while they are startled by the statement that every star in the heavens, and every point in a nebula which the most powerful telescope has not separated from its neighbor, is a sun, surrounded by inhabited planets like our own; and that immortal beings are swarming through universal space more numerous than drops of water in the ocean, or the grains of sand upon its shores. But if these persons really believe in the distances and magnitudes of the stars, and the laws which govern the binary systems of double stars, they must find it equally, if not more difficult to comprehend why innumerable suns and worlds fill the immensity of the universe, revolving round one another, and discharging their light and heat into space, without a plant to spring under their influence, without an animal to rejoice in their genial beams, and without the eye of reason to lift itself devoutly to its Creator. In peopling such worlds with life and intelligence, *we assign the cause* [the reason] *of their existence* ; and when the mind is once alive to this great truth, it cannot fail to realize the grand combination of *infinity of life with infinity of matter*.

" In support of these views, we have already alluded to the almost incredible fact, that there are in our own globe hills and strata miles in length, composed of the fossil remains of microscopic insects ; and we need scarcely remind the least informed of our readers that the air which they breathe, the water which they drink, the food which they eat, the earth on which they tread, the ocean which encircles them, and the atmosphere above their heads, are swarming with universal life. Wherever we have seen matter, we have seen life. Life

was not made for matter, but matter for life; and in whatever spot we see its atoms, whether at our feet, or in the planets, or in the remotest star, we may be sure that life is there—life to enjoy the light and heat of God's bounty, to study his works, to recognise his glory, and to bless his name.

"Those ungenial minds that can be brought to believe that the earth is the only inhabited body in the universe, will have no difficulty in conceiving that it also might have been without inhabitants. Nay, if such minds are imbued with geological truth [he means the geological theory], they must admit that for millions of years the earth was without inhabitants; and hence we are led to the extraordinary result that *for millions of years there was not an intelligent creature in the vast dominions of the universal King; and that before the formation of the protozoic strata, there was neither a plant nor an animal throughout the infinity of space!* During this long period of universal death, when nature herself was asleep, the sun with his magnificent attendants, the planets with their faithful satellites, the stars in the binary systems, the solar system itself, were performing their daily, their annual, and their secular movements unseen, unheeded, and fulfilling no purpose that human reason can conceive—lamps lighting nothing—fires heating nothing—waters quenching nothing—clouds screening nothing—breezes fanning nothing—and everything around, mountain and valley, hill and dale, earth and ocean, all *meaning nothing*.

---

"The stars  
Did wander darkling in the eternal space."

"To our apprehension, such a condition of the earth, of the solar system, and of the sidereal universe, would be the same as that of our own globe, if all its vessels of war and of commerce were traversing its seas with empty cabins and freightless holds—as if all the railways on its surface were in full activity without passengers and goods—and all our machinery beating the air, and gnashing their iron teeth without work performed. A house without tenants, a city without citizens, present to our minds the same idea as a planet without life, and a universe without inhabitants."—Pp. 184–188.

But it is not only thus indicated by the nature and office of the material worlds as subservient to intelligent creatures, that the whole universe is peopled with such inhabitants; but the creation of such a boundless rational and moral

empire is what might be expected of the Creator. As his attributes are infinite, and enable him to create, uphold, and rule a moral kingdom as vast as his material dominions are, and as boundless as he pleases, it is manifestly in harmony with his perfections and the objects for which he creates and governs creatures, that he should raise his empire to an extent so immense as to display to his children his infinite greatness, and inspire them with an awe, adoration, love, and trust, appropriate to it. To people but a single world with intelligences—to give existence to but a small number, and those of limited faculties, would imply that his wisdom and benevolence were immeasurably disproportioned to his power and knowledge—that he had far less delight in exercising and displaying his moral than his natural perfections.

A boundless material and moral empire seems equally necessary to the instruction, activity, and happiness of his moral creatures. To lead on a world of intelligences through an endless existence, means must be furnished for their everlasting advancement in the knowledge of him, and their ceaseless activity in useful and pleasing employments. Such displays of him, such means of a knowledge of him, cannot be furnished by a single world, nor by a small number of orbs. All that a group like our solar system, for example, could furnish, would at length become familiar, and be exhausted. A boundless system of worlds peopled with intelligences of various orders, the theatre of a wise and benevolent moral administration, the scenes of boundless displays of the wisdom, virtue, and happiness of holy creatures, and of the occurrence, every hour, of events of interest and beauty adapted to show forth the grandeur of the divine thoughts, and touch the heart with wonder, joy, love, and adoration, is requisite to the perfect instruction, advancement, and blessedness of an intelligent world through an interminable existence: one, that at every stage of their progress transcends their full comprehension: one whose wonders and grandeurs they feel, at every step, they can never exhaust.

And what the divine perfections and the necessities of a moral kingdom that is to endure for ever thus suggest, the Scriptures fully confirm. The boundless material empire which we know through the eye and the telescope he has



built, he himself has shown in his word, is peopled by numerous orders and innumerable multitudes of intelligent agents.

Thus it is announced to us by the voice of Jehovah himself, that when the foundation of the earth was laid, there were "morning stars that sang together, and sons of God that shouted for joy" (Job xxxviii. 7). They were inhabitants, therefore, of more than one orb. They were probably of many, and perhaps of vast groups, of immense systems; and their chant of ascriptions, of wonder, and of joy, indicates that they were aware of the great designs of the creation of our world and its associate orbs. Were their song communicated to us, we should find it, doubtless, the grateful shout of innumerable spheres, uttering their adoration, celebrating the wisdom, righteousness, and beneficence of his rule over them, ascribing to him a rightful dominion over the new-formed worlds, and breathing wishes for the eternal sanctitude and blessedness of their inhabitants; or if they had a knowledge that the earth was to be the scene of a fall and a work of redemption, we should find in it expressions of their perfect confidence in the rectitude and wisdom of God's ways, and desires to contemplate and understand the dispensations of justice and mercy he was to exercise towards the fallen; and not improbably should learn that acknowledgments and celebrations were mingled in it from thousands and myriads of orbs like this, and races like ours, of the perfect uprightness and benevolence of the great feature of the government that was to be established over man, and lead to his apostasy; namely, the trial of the parents of the race, and the transmission of the reward of their obedience, if they maintained allegiance—of the evils of their fall, if they fell, to their posterity. This great announcement from the lips of the Creator thus shows us that at the moment when he called the earth and the associate worlds of the system into existence, he already had a vast empire peopled with intelligences who witnessed, or were apprised of the act, and were aware of the reason for which he created, and was to rule the new formed spheres and the creatures who were to occupy them.

The history of the fall of our first parents, through the agency of the devil, reveals to us also that an order of intelligences then existed, essentially unlike our race, and capa-

ble of entering into animals, and using their organs, as though they were their own; and we learn from the subsequent teachings of the Bible, that a vast host of them, like that tempter, are fallen, and though originally of another sphere, now make this world a special theatre of their agency. We learn, also, that an infinite host of their order remain unfallen; that they dwell in the immediate presence of God, that they are of a nature that allows them to come to this world, and make themselves visible to, and converse with men.

The burning spirits, called seraphim, that stood above the throne of Jehovah in the vision beheld by Isaiah, vi. 1-7, having six wings, are a still different order of intelligences.

But in the New Testament it is expressly revealed that there are many orders of intelligences of eminent rank in the divine empire, and of titles differing from these. Thus, we are told (Col. i. 16) that among the all things created by the Son that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, there are thrones and lordships, principalities and authorities or powers; which are the names of orders of intelligences that have authority, and therefore imply that there are others of an inferior rank that are subject to their rule; and we are told also that Christ, at his resurrection and ascension to the right hand of the Father in heaven, was exalted above all principality, and authority, and power, and lordship, and every name that is named, not only in this age or dispensation, but in that which is to come; which implies that besides these four classes, there are other intelligent creatures also of ranks and titles that are not enumerated here, all of whom, by subjection to his sceptre, are brought into an immediate relation to him as the Redeemer of our world (Ephesians i. 20-23). We are taught, also, in another passage, that one object of the work of redemption is, to make known to these principalities and powers in the heavenly worlds, the manifold wisdom of God (Ephesians iii. 9-11).

Here is thus an explicit revelation that God has peopled the celestial worlds with intelligences of various orders and ranks, some of them of such a nature that if they were in our presence they would be visible to us, and others that are

not perceptible by our sight; for the visible and the invisible are expressly distinguished from the worlds in which they exist; and that the greatest and most peculiar measure of his administration of this world—the work of redemption—has a special reference to their instruction in the manifold wisdom of the Creator. The natures of these beings vary, doubtless, according as the spheres differ which they occupy, and their numbers are proportional to the vast bulk and the infinite crowd of the worlds which are the scene of their activity and blessedness.

That the whole material universe is peopled by intelligent beings, is indicated also with almost equal clearness in the Old Testament. Thus the Psalmist summons the inhabitants of all God's dominions to pay him the homage of their love and adoration. "Jehovah has established his throne in the heavens and his kingdom rules over all. Bless Jehovah, ye his angels that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word. Bless ye Jehovah, all his hosts, his ministers that do his pleasure. Bless ye Jehovah, all his works in all places of his dominion. Bless thou Jehovah, O my soul." Psalm ciii. 19–22. All his hosts, his servants that do his pleasure, are intelligences undoubtedly, as truly as the angels are who do his commandments and hearken to the voice of his word. It is as servants that do his pleasure that they are summoned to pay the homage of blessing or adoration and love to Jehovah; which implies that that homage is to be a special act of worship in addition to, and differing as a special act from their ordinary ministry and obedience; and indicates, therefore, that they are intelligent beings, not unconscious spheres, which are his instruments simply, not his voluntary servants. In like manner all his works in all places of his dominion, are doubtless intelligent beings who inhabit the dominions from which they are distinguished, not those material worlds themselves, or the unconscious vegetables or brute creatures that have their supreme end in a subservience to intelligent existences. And with these, all the other teachings of the Scriptures are in harmony.

It is thus not simply the indication of science and the dictate of reason, but it is the express doctrine of revelation, that the universe of worlds is peopled by a universe of intel-

ligent creatures : that God has a moral kingdom as vast and glorious as the material empire is, with which he has filled the illimitable realms of space ; that this empire is now under the sceptre of Christ, and that his sway over the world, instead of being incompatible with it, is to be the means of unveiling to the highest orders of his creatures, the glories of his wisdom, more fully than any other part of his administration !

What a contrast this picture of his kingdom—drawn by his own pencil—forms to the cold, barren, senseless, and atheistic views of the Essayist and his fellow speculatists !

#### ART. VI.—NOTES ON SCRIPTURE.

Καὶ μετὰ το ψαμίον, τότε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὁ σατανᾶς : λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ ἰησοῦς : ὁ ποιεῖς, πάσης τάχυν. After the sop Satan entered into him. Then said Jesus unto him : That thou doest, do quickly.—John xiii. 27.

The original contains one word (τότε) which is not in the translation ; yet it is very significant. It serves to denote precisely the moment of the *enlargement* of Satan's power over Judas from mere instigation to the full and corporal possession of his person. It is the contrasting word (if we may so say) to *καὶ* in the second verse. That *εἰσῆλθεν* denotes an *obsessio carnalis*, a corporal possession, is proved by many passages (Mark v. 13–ix. 25). Satan having thus become incarnate, the question occurs to whom did Jesus speak—to Judas or Satan ? In other words, Does *αὐτῷ* refer to *Σατανᾶς*, the nearest antecedent, or to Judas in the preceding verse ? If to Judas, why did not the evangelist say *λέγει οὗν ἐκεῖνῳ ὁ ἰησοῦς*—as *ἐκεῖνος* is the pronoun he had used to designate Judas (in the same and the preceding verse, and which he employs again for the same purpose in the 30th verse) ; as *that one* to whom he had given the sop (see verse 26). In verse 29th the word *αὐτῷ* can only refer to the nearest antecedent. Why then is not the same rule of construction to be applied to it in the 27th verse ? On the other hand, if the words “that thou doest, do quickly,” be understood as addressed to

Satan, we get a meaning which might well escape the apprehension of the disciples who heard them (verse 28). It may be expressed thus: "What thou (Satan) art plotting (viz. my death) thou art permitted to accomplish—with this limitation nevertheless, that thou accomplish it (*ταχιστα*) more quickly than thy malice, if uncontrolled, would incline thee to do." There was a *needs be* that our Lord should finish his work of suffering before the next sun set. The evangelist adds (as if to show how speedily Satan accomplished his work through Judas, the Priests, and Pilate), that "it was night when Judas went out," verses 30, 31. Let us assume this as the true construction and sense of the verse in question, and consider its bearing on the context and some other passages.

Evidently the disciples supposed our Lord spoke to Judas (verse 29). This was natural: They *saw* only Judas. They knew not that Satan, by their master's permission or providence, had entered the room and actually stood before them incarnate in Judas. To show how entirely they had misconceived the Lord's meaning the evangelist not only records their mistake, but tells us how they came to make it (verses 28, 29). Some thought because *Judas had the bag*, Jesus spoke to *him* (in relation to his customary duties), whereas in truth he spoke not to Judas but to his great adversary, words which absolved him from the restraint he had hitherto put upon him. (See John x. 18; Gen. iii. 15; Heb. ii. 14.) This permission was the indispensable condition of Satan's power over the woman's seed. The Saviour's mind, therefore, was at that moment intent, not on the approaching festival, but upon his final conflict with Satan, and his exodus from the cross to glory. (See verse 31; Luke ix. 31.)

Observe, also, that the object of the evangelist is to explain *clearly* to his readers a mysterious transaction, entirely misunderstood and misinterpreted by him and his fellow disciples at the time of its occurrence. His words, therefore, we should expect would be chosen and arranged so as to prevent the possibility of a mistake on the part of his readers. Had he meant to convey the idea that these words were addressed to Judas, he would have said *λεγει αυτω* (*λεγει τω Ιουδα*) (not *αυτω*). This sense of the passage enables us

also to explain the reason for inserting the parenthetical clause in the end of John xviii. 5, "And Judas also stood with them." The evangelist had already informed his readers that Judas was of the company, and in fact the leader of it (verses 2, 3). Why then did he repeat the fact? It was to show that Judas was one of those whom the Saviour's voice turned backward and prostrated. But why was this important? Because Satan stood there also incarnate in Judas, and it was a fit occasion for our Lord to prove, as it were in the very act of surrendering himself to Satan's power and malice, that the act was entirely voluntary—that no one took his life from him, but that he laid it down of himself (John x. 18). Having given this proof, he surrendered his person, and the hour and the power of darkness commenced (Luke xxii. 53, 54).

Let us turn now to Luke iv. 18. We there learn, that at the close of the temptation Satan (*ο σαταν*) kept aloof from Jesus (*ο υιος του ανθρωπου*) for (or rather until or during) a certain time. There is no evidence, we think, that Satan ever afterwards *voluntarily* approached the person of Jesus till after the supper and the washing of the disciples' feet, the evening before the crucifixion. It may be conjectured that the foul spirit entered the room, just at the time our Lord uttered the words recorded in John xiii. 28. His entrance was permitted solely for the purpose of incarnating himself in the traitor—receiving the permission of Jesus to accomplish his death,—and thus preparing himself for the hour of his power. The human soul of our blessed Lord, conscious of this purpose, and of the near approach of his final conflict (Gen. iii. 15), was troubled when the foul spirit entered, and rejoiced when he departed (verse 31) in the person of Judas. It was to this time the evangelist Luke, as we suppose, referred (See Theophylact, Diodati, Whitby, Scott, Barnes, David Martin, and the Glossa Ordinaria). Indeed one of the proofs of our Lord's Messiahship was his manifested power over Satan (Matt. xii. 28, 29; Luke x. 18), and this power he constantly exercised during the whole of his public ministry.

ART. VII.—A DESIGNATION AND EXPOSITION OF THE  
FIGURES OF ISAIAH. CHAPTER XXVIII.

A series of predictions extending to chapter xxxv. commences here, respecting Samaria, Jerusalem, the Israelites, the Messiah, and the redemption of the world under his reign.

1, 2, 3, 4. Metaphors in the use of crown, flower, fat, and smitten. "Woe to the lofty crown of the drunkards of Ephraim, the fading flower of his beautiful ornament, which is at the head of the fat valley of those who are smitten with wine," v. 1. The crown contemplated with pride by the drunkards of Ephraim, was Samaria their capital, situated on a hill at the head of a fertile vale. It is called a fading flower of their beautiful ornament, in allusion, perhaps, to a garland worn at feasts, to signify that it was already declining from the prosperity it had enjoyed. The drunkards of Ephraim were not merely the luxurious population of that metropolis, but of the whole kingdom. It bespeaks a dreadful debasement, that at such a period, when forewarned of impending judgments, such a portion of the great and influential should have addicted themselves to intoxication as to give their character to the people. To be smitten with wine, was to be stupified and paralysed by it, as though stunned by a heavy blow.

5, 6. Comparisons. "Behold the Lord has a strong and mighty one: Like a storm of hail, a destroying tempest; like a storm of mighty rushing waters, he has brought it to the ground with the hand," v. 2. The mighty one was Shalmanezzer, king of Assyria, who soon after conquered Samaria. The comparisons are not designed to indicate that his assault on the city was to be what a destructive hail-storm or a torrent of rushing waters would be to it: but that it would be to the city what such a hail tempest, and flood of rushing waters, are to the flowers, fruit trees, and grain crops, on which they usually expend their destructive force. It indicates, therefore, that the city was to be taken with ease by the Assyrians; that no effective resistance would be offered by the nation.

7, 8, 9. Metaphors in the use again of crown, flower, and fat. "With the feet shall be trodden the lofty crown of the drunkards of Ephraim, and the fading flower of his beautiful ornament which is at the head of the fat valley, shall be like a first ripe fig, which he that sees it eyes, and while it is yet in his hand, swallows it," v. 8, 4.

10. Comparison of the quickness and eagerness with which the city was to be seized and trodden down, to the rapidity and zest with which a person who sees a first ripe fig, eyes and devours it. There was to be no long resistance to the conqueror by the inhabitants; no protracted negotiations respecting the surrendry; no dictation of terms by the people. Instead, it was to fall an instant and easy prey; and was to be as subject to the will of the conqueror, as a fig is to one who has it in his hand.

11. *Hypocatastasis*. The fall of the capital, however, was not to involve the utter desertion by God of his sorrowing people. Instead they were to be led to put their hope in him, and were to receive gifts of understanding and strength suited to their need. "In that day shall Jehovah of hosts be for a crown of beauty and a diadem of glory to the remnant of his people; and for a spirit of judgment to him that sitteth in judgment, and for strength to them that turn back the battle to the gate," v. 5, 6. By the remnant of his people, are meant, it seems from the verses that follow, his people in Judea. They were not to put their trust in their capital, as Ephraim had, but were to rely on Jehovah of hosts, and were to receive from him a spirit to do justice in their judgments, and strength to repel their enemies. To "turn back the battle to the gate"—i.e. to drive a foe that had entered the city, back without the gate, is put probably by substitution for defeating their enemies, whatever might be the place of the assault, and in conditions in which they seemed for the moment sure of the victory. The passage thus indicates that God was to be their trust and their defence; that they were to be led by him to a reformation; and thence that they were to obtain strength to defeat their enemies. That they needed reformation, is shown by the next verses.

12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. Metaphors in the use of *curd*, *gone astray*, *swallowed up*, *led astray*, *stumbled*, and



full. "And these also through wine have erred, and through strong drink have gone astray. Priest and prophet have erred through strong drink, have been swallowed up of wine, have been led astray by strong drink, have erred in vision; have stumbled in judgment. For all tables are full of vomit and filth, without a place" that is clear, v. 7, 8. The reiteration of the charge in so many forms, bespeaks a general prevalence of excessive intoxication. To err, is to wander from the right path. Even the priests and prophets were addicted to brutal drunkenness, and when engaged in the functions of their offices; the prophet even in his visions, and the priest in his official judgments. To be swallowed up of wine, is to be wholly overpowered and possessed by it, like one who is engulfed in a slough or quagmire. They went to such extremes at their feasts, as to defile their tables and their apartments with vomit and filth; bespeaking the lowest grade of debasement. An awful picture of their morals and manners!

Like other drunkards they were impious towards God, and ridiculed the duties which it was the express business of their office to discharge. "Whom will he teach knowledge? And whom will he make to understand doctrine? Those weaned from the milk, and removed from the breasts. For it is rule upon rule, rule upon rule, line upon line, a little here, a little there," v. 9, 10. This seems to be uttered by the drunken priests and prophets, and to signify that they regarded his teachings as only suited to children who are just of an age to begin to learn, and are to be taught by perpetual repetition. The response is by the prophet.

20. Hypocatastasis. "Verily with stammering lips and with another tongue will he—Jehovah—speak unto this people; to whom he said, This is rest, give rest to the weary; and this is quiet; but they would not hear," v. 11, 12. That is, God had told them that the way to rest and security was to teach and obey his word. But they had refused to hear; and had mocked his word as only fit for stammerers just beginning the use of speech. Therefore he would speak to them with stammering lips and another tongue; which is put by hypocatastasis for his allowing them to neglect and pervert his word in such a manner, that it should be unintelligible to them, like the stammering of children, and become

the means of their being involved in inextricable evils, instead of obtaining security and quiet, as is indicated in the next verse.

21, 22, 23, 24. Hypocatastases in the use of fall backwards, broken, snared, and taken. "And the word of Jehovah shall be unto them, rule upon rule, line upon line, a little here, a little there, that they may go and fall backwards, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken" v. 18. The evils here represented as to spring from the mode in which the word of Jehovah was to be treated by them, are all corporeal, and such as befall persons who have become bewildered, and are rushing among pitfalls and snares, of which they are unaware. They are used by substitution for analogous religious and political evils, in which they, as a people, would become involved. Their dreams of safety would be disappointed. God would put their principles to the test, and their false reliances would be swept away by the tempest of his wrath, as the green grass and fragile flowers are struck down and crushed by a storm of hail. This is seen from the next verses.

25. Apostrophe to the rulers of Jerusalem. "Wherefore hear the word of the Lord, ye scornful men, that rule this people which is in Jerusalem. Because ye have said, We have made a covenant with death, and with the grave are we at agreement; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, it shall not come unto us: for we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves," v. 14, 15. This indicates at once an awful presumption and impiety, and an awful delusion; but it is eminently characteristic of false teachers, who have lost all proper sense of God's attributes and rule, and have struck out a philosophical and religious theory of their own. They are usually inflated with the utmost confidence of their safety in the very measures that insure their destruction.

26, 27, 28, 29, 30. Metaphors in the use of covenant, agreement, scourge, refuge, and hid. They could not, literally, make a covenant with death, and an agreement with the grave. These expressions are used by them to signify that they had, by the course they were pursuing, secured exemption from death and the grave, as certainly as though they had entered into a treaty of amity with them. Famine,

pestilence, the sword, or other instruments by which men are swept to the grave, are called the overflowing scourge, partly because, like a scourge, they are sent as punishments, and partly because of the misery and terror which they inspire. Lies are called a refuge, because they are used for concealment; and the rulers said they had hid themselves under falsehood, because they had attempted to disguise themselves by it.

God now indicates the method and the time when they and their principles were to be put to a decisive trial.

31, 32. Hypocatastases. "Therefore thus saith the Lord Jehovah, Behold I lay in Zion a stone, a stone approved, a corner-stone precious, a sure foundation: He that believeth will not be in haste," v. 16. As the apostate rulers had spoken of the means on which they relied for safety as a refuge and a hiding place, God presents the means he was to provide for the safety of his people as a massy building erected on an immovable foundation. That foundation, we learn from the New Testament, is the Messiah (Romans ix. 33, x. 11, 1 Peter ii. 6). The act of laying the foundation of such a structure is substituted, therefore, for the act of establishing him in his priestly and regal offices in Zion. It is not used by a metaphor—as the act of laying a foundation-stone was possible and appropriate to God in the human form in which he was accustomed to appear. Nor is there any affirmation in the passage that the stone meant, is the Messiah, as there would have been, had the term been used by a metaphor. The language is literal, and the act of laying such a foundation is used by a hypocatastasis, to denote the analogous act of instituting Christ, whom the stone represents, as king in Zion. The expression, "He that believeth will not be in haste"—that is, to fly in distrust and terror, is used by the same figure, to denote the analogous exemption from alarm and a disposition to fly, which not being in haste represents. The edifice Jehovah was to erect, was to be built on so precious and immovable a foundation, and was to be of such massive strength, that whoever understood its character and design, and accepted it as his refuge from the overflowing scourge of divine wrath, would not be in haste—that is, he would not have any disposition to rush away from it, under an apprehension that it would

fall; he would not have any desire to seek for another shelter, but would repose beneath it in calmness and assurance. The figure is thus one of great beauty, and indicates the safety of those who put their trust in God, in a very impressive manner.

33, 34. *Hypocatastases.* "And I will apply judgment to the line, and righteousness to the plummet," v. 17. The line and the plummet are instruments used in the erection of buildings—the first to measure lengths, the other to determine whether the walls are perpendicular. To apply judgment and righteousness to them, is to use them wisely and justly. The expressions are employed in reference to the trial to which God was to subject the apostates of his people, by substitution for analogous acts of strict truth and justice. They were to be subjected to the most impartial and effective tests. No defects would escape detection; no false appearances pass for genuine virtues.

35, 36. *Metaphors.* The figure of an edifice is now resumed in again denominating their false reliance a refuge and a hiding place. "And hail shall sweep away the refuge of falsehood, and waters shall overflow the hiding place," v. 7. Their delusions are called a refuge and a hiding place, because they had relied on them as such.

37, 38. *Elliptical metaphors* in denominating the agents by which their refuge and hiding place were to be overwhelmed and swept away, hail and a flood. In v. 3, the Assyrian who was to conquer Samaria, is compared to a hail storm and a rushing torrent. Here the power that is to destroy the false reliance of the Israelites is directly called, by an elliptical metaphor, hail and a flood. There is no other figure by which they can be used, as there is no other by which the nominatives hail and flood would not be used literally. As a hail tempest striking a building to which men had fled for shelter and crushing it, and like a flood overflowing a hiding place in which they had secreted themselves; so the agents denoted by them, whom God is to employ for the destruction of the apostate Israelites, are to overwhelm and sweep them away.

39, 40, 41, 42, 43. *Metaphors.* "And your covenant with death shall be disannulled; and your agreement with the grave shall not stand; and when the overflowing scourge

shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it," v. 18. Covenant and agreement are used by a metaphor for the resembling means by which the apostate rulers flattered themselves they had secured exemption from death and the grave. To stand is a corporeal act. Their agreement, it is said, by a metaphor, shall not stand, to signify that it shall fall, or be overthrown, like one who is unable to sustain himself in an erect posture. The pestilence or sword by which they were to be swept to destruction, is denominated a scourge, an instrument of chastisement and torture. A flood overspreads and buries, instead of trampling down. It is said by a metaphor that it shall tread them down, to denote the helplessness to which they will be reduced, and the ignominy of their destruction.

44. Metaphor in the use of take. "From the time that it goeth forth, it shall take you; for morning by morning shall it pass through, by day and by night," v. 19. To take is the act of a living agent. The scourge, it is said, shall take them from the time of its going forth, to signify that they would be subjected to it from that time.

45, 46. Hypocatastases. "And it shall be vexation only to understand the report. For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it, and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it," vs. 19, 20. These defects in a bed for the repose of the body, are used by substitution for analogous wants the Israelites were to feel, of the proper means of security and rest. They were to find no alleviating circumstances in their misfortunes. All was to be mortifying and disheartening. Like a person whose bed is too short to stretch himself, and the covering too narrow to wrap himself in it, they were to find the false religion in which they trusted, wholly inadequate to their peace and protection.

47, 48. Comparisons. "For as at Mount Parazim shall Jehovah rise up; as at the valley in Gibeon shall he be wroth, that he may do his work, his strange work, and bring to pass his act, his strange act," v. 21. The event with which God's future act is compared is probably the slaughter of the Philistines detailed Sam. v. 18-25, when, in two battles, God interposed to confound the Philistines, and give David and his troops the victory.

49. Hypocatastasis, in the use of rise up, for the act of God's providence by which he is to accomplish his work of judgment on the apostate Israelites. The infliction of vengeance on the apostate people of Israel, here predicted, is probably their conquest by the Romans, their dispersion, the termination of the temple worship, and their rejection for a time as his people; as it is implied, vs. 16, 17, that it was to take place after the coming of the Messiah. It may include the judgments, also, that are to befall them at his second coming. It is called his strange work and strange act, doubtless, because so contrary, apparently, to his covenant with Abraham, so unimagined by them, and so fraught with mystery and despair. He warns them, therefore, to cease from their scoffs.

50. Hypocatastasis, in the use of bands, for the analogous means by which they would be made the victims of the divine vengeance. "Now, therefore, mock not, lest your bands be strong: For I have heard from the Lord Jehovah of hosts, a consumption decreed against the whole earth," v. 22. This shows that the infliction, at least in its final form, is to extend to all nations; and is that, therefore, probably in which the Israelites are to share when Christ comes the second time to take vengeance on his enemies of all classes, and when many of the rebellious Israelites, with the hosts of the Gentiles gathered against them, are to perish in Palestine" (Zech. xiv. 1-15, Isaiah lxvi. 15-17, Rev. xix. 11-21).

51. Apostrophe. "Give ye ear, and hear my voice; hearken, and hear my speech," v. 23. This is addressed to the scoffing priests and rulers, and their party, and is a summons to notice the manner in which the husbandman proceeds in preparing his ground for a crop, sowing his seeds, and at the harvest separating the grain from the stalk—it being an intimation that God will, in like manner, take the requisite steps in bringing the world of men to the proper condition for the separation which, at the great harvest, is to be made between the righteous and the wicked; and that he will proceed as rapidly in the work, as its nature will allow.

"Does the ploughman plough every day?" *i. e.* does he do nothing but plough? "Does he not open"—*i. e.* loosen

or break its clods—"and level his ground? When he has levelled the surface of it, does he not cast abroad dill, and scatter cummin, and plant wheat in order, and barley in the designated place? For God instructs him aright—his God teaches him," vs. 24-26. As he is furnished by God with wisdom thus to take the proper measures for raising the several species of grain, and bringing them to maturity, so the implication is, God will take equally wise measures to bring the several classes of his moral subjects to a preparation for the harvest that awaits them.

When the crops of the husbandman have ripened, he then uses means equally suited to the nature of each to separate the seed from the stalk, and prepare it for the garner.

52. *Hypocatastasis.* "So the dill is not threshed with a corn-drag, nor the cart-wheel turned upon cummin; but dill is beaten out with a staff, and cummin with a rod. Bread-corn must be bruised; but he will not always be threshing it, not always break it with the wheel of his cart, nor always crush it with his horsemen. This also proceedeth from the Lord of hosts, who is wonderful in counsel, great in working," v. 27-29. The expression, "This proceedeth from the Lord of hosts," which is descriptive of a movement in space, is used by substitution to signify that it originates with him, or is of his wonderful counsel and skilful working. As the husbandman, thus, under his guidance, uses suitable instruments to thresh the different grains, and separate them from the stalk and chaff; so God will use instruments equally proper and efficacious to separate his true people from apostates and aliens, when the time comes for the gathering and judgment of the nations. The exemplification implies, therefore, that God's present administration is preparatory to another; that he, like the husbandman, is proceeding as rapidly in preparing for the end of the present system, as the nature of men, and the great objects he is pursuing permit; and that they are to receive a treatment at length, when the final award is determined, that corresponds to their character.

## ART. VIII.—HINTS TO ORTHODOX ANTIMILLENARIANS.

BY A COUNTRY SUBSCRIBER.

AMONG those antimillenarians who hold the distinguishing doctrines of grace as taught by the Reformers, many are beginning to perceive the importance, and some the urgent necessity, of a refutation of millenarianism, in order to the maintenance of their peculiar views. They know that the attempts at refutation hitherto made have been unsuccessful, being based upon gratuitous assumptions and misapprehensions, and supported by a system of interpretation, which, if applied to the Scriptures universally, would subvert all the orthodox doctrines which they hold. In a word, they feel the necessity of a refutation by plain scripture testimonies construed by the same rules which they employ in determining the meaning of those portions of the Bible which teach the doctrines of grace.

It is, therefore, by no means extraordinary that they are ill at ease in respect to their own sentiments on the subject. Many of the notions which they entertain they have taken upon trust. When called on for reasons they are embarrassed, and sometimes even irritated. Their theory of Christ's kingdom, and of the millennium, upon which their system of practical benevolence is founded, they naturally cling to as of vital importance; and they are as little prepared patiently to hear it called in question, as the Jews of the first age were their theory of the first advent. The more philosophic among them, indeed, feeling certain that they rightly understand those doctrines which they deem necessary to salvation, and no less certain that in some way the unknown future will be provided for, treat the subject with apparent indifference. But the sensitive give scope to impatience and ill temper; while the attitude which others assume, implies that they consider it as of no importance whether the second advent of Christ is to precede or to follow the millennium; whether he is to come visibly in the clouds, destroy his incorrigible enemies, raise his deceased saints, and reign visibly on the hill of Zion, or only to come



spiritually; or whether the prophecies are, or are not, rightly understood before their fulfilment.

They cannot, however, under this view or any other, conceal it from themselves, that millenarianism relies not upon any ancient or modern philosophies, or any devices of man's wisdom, but directly and wholly upon the oracles of Divine Revelation; that it claims to be part and parcel of the orthodoxy of the first age; that since a due examination and discussion of the subject has been revived, millenarians have been increasing in numbers; and that orthodox antimillenarians are decreasing, and likely still to decrease, both by the defection of some from orthodoxy to Pelagian or other errors, and by the conversion to the millenarian faith of those who examine far enough to discover the true character of their present system.

From this view of the state of the question, taken in connexion with the extraordinary aspect of things at present in every part of the church and the world, it appears in no degree likely that the subject will be dropped and again fall into neglect. The time for the fulfilment of those predictions which relate to the fall of mystic Babylon and the destruction of antichrist is, on all hands, believed to be not very remote; and as it draws on, and the parties to be involved in the impending scenes rise into view and marshal their forces, the question whether the Scriptures teach that the Son of God is to descend visibly to the earth to deliver his saints and destroy his enemies, or spiritually, to convert the worshippers of the beast and false prophet, will be likely to gain increased attention. Discussion is therefore likely to be continued. Those who profess to hold the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures—the orthodox, who derive their doctrines from the inspired oracles by rightly interpreting them—will find it necessary, in order to sustain their interpretation of those doctrines, to decide whether the same principles of interpretation are not to be applied to the prophecies; and will be obliged, we apprehend, either to refute millenarianism by those principles, or else to embrace it.

It is, then, not without reason that we volunteer some hints to those of them who are orthodox, in the hope that we may stimulate them to examine the subject, and attempt with as little delay as possible, not a spiritual, alle-

gorical, or mystical, but a scriptural refutation, if it is practicable, of what they so confidently reject. Passing by the necessity of their first investigating the matter sufficiently to ascertain what millenarianism really is, that they may correctly decide whether it is a doctrine of Scripture, a part of the faith originally delivered to the saints, or whether it is merely a fanciful theory; we suggest, as a first *hint*, that they should, at the outset, consider the *disadvantages of their position* as orthodox theologians in openly rejecting the millenarian faith. They plainly need to be rallied and roused on this subject by some means, for they seem to be unconscious of their real condition.

We invite, then, the professors of theology, ecclesiastical history, and biblical criticism, the writers and reviewers of church history, and orthodox ministers and laymen generally, to note their position in its relation to the *past*,—*their historical position*. And let them consider that the historical facts, that the doctrines of grace which they hold, were held by the apostles, are plainly recorded in the New Testament, and were adhered to by the ministers and churches of the first two centuries, are not more certainly facts, than that millenarianism was also held by those ministers and churches, and was by them held to be no less clearly taught in the New Testament, than the other articles of their faith. In proof of this, let them refer to the church history of those centuries; and for evidence that antimillenarianism originated with those who rejected or swerved from the orthodox doctrine, and was the offspring of a false system of interpretation, let them examine the history of the third and ensuing centuries. At the same time let them study the history of the introduction of that spiritualizing method of interpretation in which antimillenarianism originated, and on which alone it has been defended, that they may be enabled to see why it should not be employed in opposition to doctrines which they reject, while a different method is necessarily taken in support of doctrines which they hold. This, if not already, is likely ere long to be as necessary to their reputation for intelligence and candor, as to the defence of their orthodoxy. Studied silence, affected sneers, bold misrepresentation may serve for a while, but soon grow stale and discreditable. They imply weakness, prejudice, bad passions, and instead

of overthrowing the assailed, recoil upon the assailants. If men professing to be orthodox employ them, honest men will cease to trust them, either from a suspicion of their motives or from a doubt of their competency.

In regard to the rise and progress of defection from the primitive orthodoxy, it is historically certain that before the close of the second century, a taste for *philosophy* very much like that which is seen in our own times among the teachers of the church, was introduced and became prevalent, "which struck at the very vitals of religion, and tended, in no small degree, to affect the credit of those sacred writings on which the entire system of Christian discipline relies for support." A strenuous controversy ensued between those addicted to philosophical speculations and those "who continued steadfastly attached to that ancient and simple species of piety which had been delivered down by the apostles and their disciples. The Christian churches thus became divided into two separate parties which opposed each other with the utmost warmth. . . . The issue at length was, that victory declared itself in favor of the patrons of philosophy." "When once the passion for philosophizing had taken possession of the minds of the Egyptian teachers and others, and had been gradually diffused by them in various directions throughout the church, the holy and beautiful simplicity of early times very quickly disappeared, and was followed by a most remarkable and disastrous alteration in nearly the whole system of Christian discipline. This very important and deeply to be regretted change, had its commencement in the century now under review [the second]—but it will be in the succeeding one that we shall have to mark its chief progress. One of the earliest evils that flowed from this immoderate attachment to philosophy, was the violence to which it gave rise in the *interpretation of the Holy Scriptures*. For whereas the Christians had, from a very early period, imbibed the notion that under the words, laws, and facts, recorded in the sacred volume, there is a latent sense concealed. . . . no sooner did this passion for philosophizing take possession of their minds than they began with wonderful subtlety to press the Scriptures into their service, in support of all such principles and maxims as appeared to them consonant to reason; and at the same time

most wretchedly to *pervert and twist every part of those divine oracles which opposed itself to their philosophical tenets or notions.*"

The hotbed of this ancient apostasy, and model of its German successor of the present day, was the theological seminary of Alexandria, under the guidance successively of Pantænus, Clement, and Origen. A diversity of philosophical sects soon appeared, under different leaders, who, just like our moderns, sought to reconcile Christianity with their theories, by allegorizing and mystifying the language of its records. In the progress of these changes, under the lead of the prefects of the Alexandrian school, and especially that of Origen, early in the third century, the false method of interpretation became predominant. Origen, having with the philosophy of his teachers adopted their notion of a double sense in Scripture, so amplified and adorned that notion "that it afforded him ample means of bending the sense of Scripture to suit his purpose, and eliminating from the Bible whatever was repugnant to his favorite opinions." He, accordingly, it was, who *first attempted to controvert the millenarian doctrine*; and his attempt, like all those which have succeeded it, was founded on his false system of interpretation. Mosheim in his *Historical Commentaries on the first three centuries* (from which work the foregoing and ensuing quotations are made) observes, Vol. ii., sec. 38, that "among the Jewish opinions to which in this age philosophy proved detrimental, the most distinguished was *that of the reign of Christ a thousand years, with the saints restored to their bodies*. This opinion, I believe, was introduced into the church near the commencement of the Christian commonwealth. And down to *the times of Origen*, all the teachers who were so disposed openly professed and taught it; although there were some who either denied it, or at least called it in question. But *Origen assailed it fiercely*; for *it was repugnant to his philosophy*; and by the *system of biblical interpretation* which he discovered, he gave a different turn to those texts of Scripture on which the patrons of this doctrine most relied. . . . It is certain that in the second century, the opinion that Christ would reign a thousand years on the earth, was diffused over a great part of Christendom, and that the most eminent doctors favored it; and no controversy

with them was moved by those who thought otherwise. Tertullian speaks of it as the common doctrine of the whole church." . . . "It is certain from *Justin Martyr* and others that *very many*, and they men of great influence, thought as he did (*i. e.* were millenarians), nor were they on that account taxed with corrupt doctrine." . . . "Origen was obliged (by his philosophy) to modify and debase the Christian doctrine of the future resurrection of our bodies, and of the reunion of our souls to them, so that it should contain nothing opposed to his opinion of the nature of a rational soul; and that he did so, is very well known—and then, how much the method of interpreting the Bible, which he prescribed, might dissuade him from admitting this millennial kingdom, the copious remarks already made upon it, make manifest. For he wished to have the literal and obvious sense of the words disregarded, and an *arcane* sense, lying concealed in the envelope of the words, to be sought for. But the advocates of an earthly kingdom of Christ rested their cause solely on the natural and proper sense of certain expressions in the Bible. . . . Nepos called the opposers of this kingdom of Christ *Allegorists*; because they maintained that the texts of Scripture on which the friends of the doctrine rested its defence, were allegories or mere metaphors. This appellation seems to have been given them in contempt by their antagonists."

Some, at least, of our orthodox antimillenarians will, we hope, feel obliged to us for bringing the foregoing extracts to their notice, and will inquire into the history of this allegoristic theory for themselves. It will afford them a satisfactory clue to most of the heresies, anti-millenarianism included, that have corrupted the truth, and distracted the church. In addition to the above they will find other and abundant evidences, that millenarianism was uninterruptedly held by the orthodox down to the third century—that it was assailed, then as now, out of zeal for a false philosophy, and by means of a false method of interpretation, got up for the purpose, and employed, from that day to this, by crowds of heretics and visionaries. Hence the vagaries of Origen himself—such as his views of the atonement, as "not being vicarious, and as having the same reference to the inhabitants of the sun, moon, and stars, demons and angels, as to

men;" and equally false notions on other theological subjects.

Mosheim's opinion that the millenarian doctrine of "the reign of Christ on earth a thousand years, with the risen saints restored to their bodies," was inherited from the Jews—though that paternity appears to be regarded by some of our modern and most zealous antimillenarians to be a sufficient reason for rejecting it—is, in truth, greatly in its favor. For the Jewish Scriptures, if not eliminated after the manner of Origen, no less clearly and conclusively teach that doctrine than the New Testament; or than they teach the truth concerning the first advent, the atonement, and all the doctrines of inspiration.

It is therefore manifestly necessary to their own credit, that our orthodox antimillenarians should refute millenarianism by the Scriptures, interpreted not after the method of Origen, but by that method on which alone the peculiar doctrines of grace can be maintained. If the millenarians of the present day, and the entire succession of them from the days of the apostles, were not, in the highest and best sense, orthodox; if, by virtue of a false system of interpretation, they were Unitarians or Pelagians, rationalistic developmentists, or pantheists, then the orthodox antimillenarians might with some semblance of plausibility attempt to meet them on the ground of their allegorical or spiritualizing system. But, as things are, they are without excuse in taking that course, and are chargeable, at least, with constructive treason against their own orthodoxy.

But if their position is thus disadvantageous in respect to the past, it is no less so in relation to the present times. Instead of standing forth, as regards their principles of interpretation, as distinctively with reference to the whole Bible as with reference to their orthodox doctrines, they class themselves, by their spiritualizing interpretations of the prophecies, with the Romanists, neologists, and other partisans of error. Every false system extant which they condemn as inconsistent with their orthodox doctrines, is demonstrably founded on essentially the same false method of interpretation which they themselves apply to the prophetic Scriptures and the millenarian doctrine. Their position is thus, considering that they are men of sense and

learning, absolutely ludicrous and discreditable. Surrounded as they are, and pressed upon from all sides, by innumerable sects and heresies, they can scarcely take a step, even in self-defence, without exhibiting to the view both of friends and foes, the grossest inconsistency. For while they follow the method of Origen, in relation to the prophecies of Christ's coming and millennial reign, they are obliged to turn their backs upon that method, when they attempt to defend their own orthodox doctrines, or to refute any established or new-blown heresy. Many of them are, no doubt, conscious of this unfortunate feature of their system, and take refuge in silence and affected indifference. A most awkward position truly for this boasted age of science and biblical criticism! A humiliating attitude for those to assume, upon whose learning and truth the defence of the apostolic doctrines of grace, their propagation over the whole earth, and the subversion of the heresies of Christendom, and the false systems of the pagan world, are supposed chiefly to depend!

Having said enough to commend our object to orthodox antimillenarians, concerning the awkwardness of their theological posture in relation to the past and the present, we hasten next to suggest that they institute an inquiry into their knowledge of the real doctrines of millenarianism, and of their own system. There is more occasion for this, we apprehend, than they are aware of. Though in respect to various other subjects, they have knowledge and candor, in regard to this they are undoubtedly very deficient. The Scriptural apostolic doctrine of millenarianism they have not studied, and do not understand. Instead, the notion they entertain of it is a distorted caricature. Their condition, in relation to it, is much like theirs who reject and deride Christianity under the impression that its nature, tendencies, and results, are justly represented by the Popish system. They are like men who, betrayed into false conceits and impressions in respect to the orthodox system of doctrines, denounce and oppose it as irreligious and immoral. Under the impulse of their wrong views, and their prejudices, accordingly, they assail what they do not comprehend, and declaim against what they should receive and maintain.

This is manifest from the works some of them have published, and others applauded. Not a volume, essay, or re-

view can be named, in which they have assailed millenarianism, to which these strictures are not applicable. The writers, imagining, without pausing to examine either side of the question, that they know all that is to be known about it, or at least enough to enable them to settle it decisively, display their prowess in attacking their own false conceptions, the errors and extravagances of antimillenarian fanatics, or else, which has repeatedly happened, dogmas and conceits, that instead of forming a part of millenarianism, belong exclusively to their own system. They clearly show that they neither understand the millenarian doctrines nor their own theory; and if they accomplish anything, it is but a bungling misrepresentation of those whom they oppose, or a downright confutation of themselves.

The condition of some of the writers to whom we refer is, in fact, pitiable. In place of aiding, they have injured their cause, and disgusted their friends; and what is still more discreditable, have not had the magnanimity to acknowledge the errors and misrepresentations of which they have been convicted, and of which they are conscious.

There is apparently, now, no alternative left to the party but a dead silence, or an attempt to refute millenarianism by direct and unequivocal declarations of Scripture. For there is no theological teacher or writer now on the stage, who has any such potent influence over the public mind, that he can, like Origen, "bend the sense of Scripture to suit his purpose," and "eliminate from it whatever is repugnant to his favorite opinions," assailing millenarianism on the ground of its being hostile "to his philosophy," and by his interpretations "giving a different turn to those texts of Scripture on which the patrons of the millenarian doctrine most rely," or one, even, who will venture publicly to propose "to have the literal and obvious sense of the words disregarded, and an arcane sense"—a hidden, mystical, fancied meaning—imagined to be "concealed in the envelope of the words," to be substituted in its place. Whoever undertakes this must, if he ever pretended to be orthodox, have ceased to be so; and must select for his scene of operations some ecclesiastical coterie, or school already corrupted, like that of Alexandria under Clement, by false philosophy.



We add a further hint, that if the orthodox antimillenarians intend to rest on the allegorical system of interpretation, they should make themselves well acquainted with the speculations of its author; and to assist them in it, we quote from the same authority as before, premising that Origen, in his character of philosopher, held to a "two-fold world—a lower and an upper, or a visible and an invisible, a corporeal and a spiritual; and to a correspondence of things in this *visible world*, with the things of the *invisible* or *conceived world*. Considering this doctrine as most certain, he (in his character of theologian) transferred it entire to the Holy Scriptures; and therefore he affirmed, whatever the inspired writers tell us respecting changes and occurrences in this lower and visible world, relates also to the affairs and the history of the upper and invisible world."

"As there is a *two-fold* mystical world—the one here below, the church, and the other above, the exemplar after which this material and corporeal world was created; so there is also a *two-fold* mystical sense of Scripture—the one relating to the church, and the other to the celestial world. That which relates to the kingdom of Christ, or the church, is called the *allegorical* sense; that which relates to the celestial world, the *anagogical* sense. . . . All the things which occur among men, occur also in the heavenly world; souls live there as men do on earth; in heaven angels are rulers, and carry on wars just as kings and princes do here below. . . . Whatever the sacred books narrate respecting the countries, the nations, the kings, and the occurrences of this world, must be equally true of the heavenly world; so that the history of our world is also the history of the celestial world, and of its inhabitants."

"The *mystical* sense of Scripture is that which presents to us the nature, state, and history of the spiritual or mystical world. Besides this corporeal or material world, there is another—a spiritual world, beyond the reach of our senses; and this other world is also two-fold, celestial and terrestrial; and the terrestrial may also be called the *mystical* world. This *mystic* terrestrial world [which makes the third, of that sort, if we count right] is the church of Christ on earth. The other, the celestial or spiritual world, is in the upper regions; and it corresponds in all its parts with the

lower or corporeal world. For the world in which we now dwell was fashioned after the model of the world above. That world beyond our ken, which we can contemplate only in thought, is, as before stated, perfectly like to this corporeal world; and, of course, it is divided into provinces, just as this world is. Therefore, as there is a terrestrial Palestine, Jerusalem, Tyre, Sidon, Arabia, &c., so the upper or celestial world has similar places and provinces. [And, by parity of reasoning, the Christian church, which is one of the mystic worlds perfectly like the celestial, must have a Palestine, Jerusalem, Tyre, &c., which correspond to the mystic interpretations before-mentioned.] The inhabitants of the celestial world are souls or spirits; its kings and magistrates are the angels, both the good and the bad. Whatever events occur in this world, the same occur in the world above; and there is a perfect similitude between these worlds."

On the broad foundation thus laid down, Origen asserted that "whatever in the sacred books conflicts with his philosophy, must not be taken literally, but must be converted into allegory. Safely posted behind this rule, he could easily resist whatever the Scriptures might oppose to his opinions, and whatever the philosophers might urge against Christianity; . . . he believed that the grounds of all the doctrines taught in the Scriptures, might be deduced from the principles of philosophy; . . . that those philosophical grounds of Christian doctrines are wrapt up in figures, images, and facts, in the sacred volume; for if we adhere to the literal meaning, that harmony between religion and philosophy cannot be found; . . . that those philosophical grounds of Christian doctrines were all taught in the Scriptures, not indeed especially, but with some obscurity, and, as it were, covertly; and therefore they can be discovered, and drawn forth by the sagacious, especially by those whom God favors with the gift of language, and of the so-called *knowledge*; . . . that it was greatly to the honor and glory of Christianity, that the Holy Scriptures which are its source, should be accounted a book *differing fundamentally from all human compositions*, one full of various and recondite mysteries; . . . that in the objections of the enemies of Christianity, there are not a few things [of which mille-

narianism undoubtedly was one] which can in no way be cleared up and confuted, unless we abandon the historical and grammatical sense, and resort to allegories; . . . that the sacred books have a three-fold sense—a body, or a historical and grammatical sense—a soul, or a moral sense—and lastly, a spirit, or a mystical or spiritual sense—as a man consists of three parts: a body, a sensitive soul, and a rational soul; . . . that, as the flesh or body is the lowest and most ignoble part of man, so also the literal sense of Scripture, which is like the body, is far below, or inferior to the moral and mystical senses. And as the body often induces even pious and good men to commit sin, so also the proper sense of the words of Scripture may lead incautious readers into errors and faults; . . . yet, to common people and the more ignorant, the literal sense is not altogether worthless; . . . but those who possess a little more wisdom and intelligence than the vulgar, ought to seek after the *soul* of the sacred Scriptures, passing beyond their body or literal sense. . . . And those who have attained to perfection, or to the highest degree of piety, should ascend higher still, and pry with all their might into the spirit of the sacred books, or into their *spiritual and mystical sense*."

These specimens ought, we should think, to satisfy sincere antimillenarians, at least, of the extraordinary capacity of the father and master of allegorical and spiritual interpretation, and first assailant of millenarianism in the church, and enable them to judge of his claims to be blindly followed, as he has been, in a large degree, by antimillenarian commentators, biblical critics, and theological teachers from his age to the present time. And surely, if they adopt his system of a double sense, they ought to know what the philosophy is on which it rests; and if they adopt his principles of interpretation, they ought openly to avow them, and to meet the consequences to which they lead in respect to the other teachings of the Scriptures, as well as the great doctrine of Christ's pre-millennial coming and reign. We commend these hints to their consideration, and hope that those of them who may hereafter attempt the vindication of their peculiar views, will candidly state what the principles of interpretation are on which they proceed: whether, if alle-

gorical, they hold the philosophy of Origen, on which that system is founded: and whether they are prepared to apply those principles to the doctrinal and historical, as well as the prophetic Scriptures, and follow them to their natural results.

---

ART. IX.—THE TACTICS OF A CLASS OF ANTI-MILLENARIANS.

THE Editors of the Puritan Recorder published in their paper, July 13th, an article from the pen, we understand, of Dr. Cooke, in which they present what they denominate "A Difficulty," which they allege attaches to the views we have presented in the Journal of the "ultimate state of the church," or its condition subsequently to Christ's second coming. In the Recorder, August 3d, they inserted the following reply.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—In your paper of the 13th inst., you state two difficulties which you feel in respect to the views of "the millennial state," presented in the Theological and Literary Journal for July; and offer them, you say, "not in a spirit of captious criticism, but to get relief to our wonder;" and you intimate that you are unable to conceive by what expedient I escape them. You will doubtless be pleased to receive an answer, and to communicate it to your readers.

The representation to which you object is, that "the assurance is given in many passages of the Prophets, that men are to subsist on the earth and multiply for ever; that the curse of want, sorrow, and death, is soon to be repealed; the earth made a paradise, and the scene of Christ's visible presence and reign; and that all nations are to be converted, and go on through interminable ages in sanctitude and happiness." To this should be added, the doctrine not quoted by you, that at Christ's second coming, the holy dead are to be raised, invested with the offices of kings and priests, and reign with him on the earth during the thousand years.

"Now to this idea," you say, "a host of difficulties present them-

selves. We have room to name only two; each of which seems to be fatal to it. One is, that in the Resurrection state, which Mr. Lord, if we understand him, makes to be the millennial state, and which, in any view, must be the final state, to which these quotations refer, Christ says, they neither marry nor are given in marriage; but are *isaggeloi*: which we take to be at least, *unmarriageable*, and without generations or children."

Your difficulty in respect to this, however, has manifestly risen either from your misapprehending Christ, or misconceiving me. If you turn to Matt. xxii. 24-30, or the corresponding passage, Luke xx. 34-36, you will see that Christ's declaration which you allege, refers exclusively to those who are to be *raised from the dead*: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God. For in *the Resurrection*, they neither marry nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels of God in heaven." The language of Luke is equally specific: "But they who are counted worthy of that age, and of *the Resurrection from the dead*,"—implying that all the dead are not to be counted worthy of that age and the Resurrection—"neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels." The proposition thus relates solely to those who are to be raised from the dead, and be made equal to the angels. It has no reference to man in the natural life. If, then, you supposed it to relate to mankind in the natural body, as well as to those who are then to be raised from the dead, it is plain that you misapprehended Christ. If, instead of that error, you had the impression that I hold and teach that *those who are to be raised from the dead*, are to marry and be given in marriage, and have offspring, then you equally misconceive and misrepresent me. Where, let me ask, do you find any authority either in the articles to which you refer, or anything else that has proceeded from my pen, for such an imputation? You will search in vain for anything to justify, or yield the least color of authority to it. I cannot but be surprised that you should have ventured on so gross a misrepresentation. You would feel it to be a very extraordinary act of injustice, were I or any other person to bring such an accusation against you. It could not, however, be more mistaken, nor do I know how it could be more inexcusable, than its allegation against me is by you. I am glad to believe, therefore, that you will find yourselves wholly relieved from this difficulty.

"Our other difficulty," you say, "is the want of room for such an endless increase. Earth is limited in its space; but the multiplication of inhabitants supposed, is unlimited in numbers, and unreduced by death. If all these people, in unspotted sanctitude, living in immortal youth, find it one of their privileges to rear children, it does

not appear that any limits will be set to the progeny of each pair. So that every pair will go on multiplying for ever, and all the checks which sin, and disease, and death interpose to such an increase will be removed. What an astonishing increase will that be! But we will not press the point of the rapidity of this increase. Let Mr. Lord tell us what this shall be. But let it be what it may, if the increase is to go on, as he says, for ever, the time will come when there will not be room enough on the face of the earth for a standing place for all its inhabitants."

I shall not reply to that part of this passage, which assumes or asserts, that if the race is to multiply for ever, all the individuals who belong to it must contribute to the multiplication at every stage of the future. That, you are aware, is your own construction, or fancy, and has nothing in what I have taught on the subject to sustain it. I have confined myself to the statement and proof of the fact, that the Scriptures indicate that *the race* is for ever to continue here in the natural life, and to multiply.

As to your difficulty in respect to this, then, I reply, first, The ground on which you proceed in it, is a very improper and unsafe one; as it implies that nothing is to be received as revealed and true, that cannot be satisfactorily understood and explained. Take away that assumption, and your objection becomes wholly irrelevant. For if God has plainly revealed that mankind are to exist and multiply here for ever, then it is to be received as a revealed certainty; whether we are made acquainted with all the consequences that are to spring from it, or know what the measures are that are to be taken to meet them or not. You surely are not prepared to dissent from this; you cannot mean formally to sanction the assumption on which your objection proceeds. You will admit that the question, whether the doctrine I maintain is true or not, is to be determined solely by what is taught respecting it in the Scriptures; not by our ability or inability to determine how certain consequences to which it leads, or seems likely to lead, are to be provided for.

Next, your objection is as applicable to the scheme of administration which would have been pursued, had man not fallen, as it is to that which is to be instituted when the curse of the fall is repealed. You, doubtless, will admit that if man had not fallen, he would have continued to reside in this world, and to multiply at least to the present time, and probably for ever; and that, at any rate, a time would have come, doubtless long since, when the number of the race would have reached the utmost capacity of the earth to accommodate them; and that some method would have been provided to exempt them from that difficulty, consistent with man's nature, compatible with the continuance and well-being of the species, and worthy of the

wisdom and benevolence of God. Now if you hold to this, why do you object to a dispensation, at a future time, that is to give rise to similar results? If one is compatible with God's power, wisdom, and goodness, and was prevented from going into effect solely by the revolt of man; why may not the other be equally possible and compatible with God's perfections? You doubtless cannot have seen that you were objecting against precisely such a condition of things as would have risen if man had continued in allegiance. It is very unfortunate for an argument, that it has such a hostile bearing on what God has been pleased to pronounce "very good."

Thirdly. But we are not left wholly uninstructed in respect to the mode in which the difficulty which perplexes you is to be avoided. The Scriptures relate that, in the early ages of the world, several persons were translated to another scene of existence, and passed through a change probably, from the glory in which Moses and Elijah appeared on Mount Tabor, essentially like that which will take place in the bodies of the saints at their resurrection. We are expressly taught also, that saints who are living on the earth at Christ's second coming, are to experience a great and glorious change, that will fit them to be caught up in the air to meet the Lord, and dwell for ever in his presence. Here, then, is at least a sufficient indication of what may be a great feature of the dispensation he is then to institute; and may prevent the overcrowding of the earth with numbers, by rapid multiplication, of which you are so apprehensive. And this, allow me to remind you, is the way in which I have repeatedly stated, I suppose the over-population of the world is to be avoided, as you will see by referring to the Journal for July, 1853, pp. 92-94.

Your second objection is thus as causeless and mistaken as the first. The question whether the doctrine I entertain is to be received or not, turns not at all on any such consideration, but solely on the question whether it is taught in the Scriptures; and that it is, in my judgment, you will see fully proved in the article to which I have already referred, July, 1853, pp. 77-80, and in several discussions in the preceding volumes. Dan. vii. 13, 14, 18, 27, and Rev. xi. 15-18, show that *this world* is to be the scene of Christ's eternal kingdom; that it is to embrace the whole earth; that he is to reign in it through the ages of ages; and that the beings over whom he is to reign, are to be "all people, nations, and languages," "under the whole heaven." That they are to be human beings, and in the natural life, we presume you will not deny. This kingdom, it is shown in both passages, is to be instituted in its millennial form at, or immediately after, the period of the destruction of the antichristian power, symbolized by the ten-horned beast. You hold, undoubtedly, that

men are to continue in the world in the natural body, and propagate, *after that period*. The class who doubt and deny it belong to a quite different body from yourselves. But that men are to continue *for ever* here, and multiply, *after the creation of the new heavens and new earth*, you will find taught with equal explicitness in Isaiah lx. 15–22, where it is promised that Zion—Jerusalem—shall be an *eternal* excellency, the joy of *many generations*; that the Lord shall be unto her an *everlasting light*; that her people shall all be righteous; that *they shall inherit the land for ever*; and that a little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation," which indicates the birth of offspring; while it is foretold (Isaiah lxx. 17–25), that during this eternal age of their inheriting the land, they are to build, plant, and bring forth children, and that they are to be the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them. Similar predictions are made in a great number of passages of the Old Testament; such as Joel iii. 20, where it is predicted that Judah shall dwell for ever and ever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation. In these passages I have thus the most explicit authority for the doctrine I maintain. It is as directly and clearly foreshown as any event of the future. Can you confute this construction of these predictions by the laws of philology, or any other legitimate principle? Are you aware of any antimillenarian who has confuted it, or even attempted it by legitimate criticism? Are you aware of a single passage of the sacred word that teaches the opposite doctrine? I presume not. If the question then, Which doctrine is true?—is to be tried by the Scriptures, it will be found that it is yours that is not only without any support from them, but that directly contradicts their plain and express teachings; and it is you, consequently, that are to meet the difficulties of so embarrassing a position—not I.

You have fallen, Messrs. Editors, into another error, in representing that "This idea of propagation in *heaven* was one of the grosser things connected with the ravings of the Celestial Prophets and Anabaptists of Germany." The Anabaptists of Germany neither held the "idea of propagation in *heaven*," nor of Christ's personal reign, and the reign of the risen saints with him on earth. Instead, they concurred with modern antimillenarians, in maintaining that it is men in the natural body who are to establish the millennial kingdom, and are to reign in it as kings; and it was under that notion that they plunged into their horrid excesses, as you may see stated in the Journal for July, 1852, pp. 122–125, and will find to be true, by referring to the proper authorities.

I regret, gentlemen, that you have fallen into these misapprehensions; but your love of truth will prompt you to counteract them as far



as you may, by the publication of this letter. Recommending greater caution in offering objections to the doctrine of Christ's coming and reign, and with friendly wishes, I am,

Respectfully yours,

D. N. LOZN.

*New York, July 21, 1854.*

This letter, instead of relieving their perplexities, prompted a response, in which they re-asserted, and endeavored to prove the validity of their second objection. To that article we returned the following answer:—

MESSRS. EDITORS:—I thank you for giving a place in your paper to the letter I addressed to you a few days ago. Some of your "Remarks" on it, however, glance so wide of the right, that I deem it proper to make the following response.

In the first place, you seem to intimate that the belief is peculiar to me, that there are to be "two kinds of men,"—human beings—"on earth in the millennial state." I am surprised at this. I am not at all singular in holding that belief. Can you point to a millenarian who does not entertain it? I know of none. It has been the faith of those who look for Christ's premillennial coming and reign on the earth with the risen saints, during the thousand years, from the days of the apostle John. It is the belief of millenarians, as much as it is of antimillenarians, that men are to continue in the natural life during that period. That which is peculiar to millenarians is that they hold that Christ is then to reign on the earth with the glorified saints. Of course, if the risen saints and men in the natural life have their residence on the earth during that age,—the one in the station of kings and priests, the other in the condition of subjects—there will then be two classes of human beings on the earth.

In the next place, you represent that you have not found anything in the word of God that indicates that there are to be two such classes on the earth during that period. You say, "In our simplicity we supposed, that if the New Jerusalem came down from God out of heaven, and spread itself over the earth, the state of men on earth would be purely a heavenly state, and all its inhabitants would be citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem;" and after quoting several passages in respect to the resurrection of the dead, and change of the living saints, you add: "This, we thought, placed in one category both the risen dead, and the living servants of Christ."

There is, however, the clearest indication that the risen saints symbolized by the New Jerusalem, are to differ in the most marked manner from the living nations. Thus, the city is to have "no need of

the sun, neither of the moon to shine in it; for the glory of God" is to "lighten it, and the Lamb is" to be "the light thereof." But "*the nations of them which are saved, shall walk in the light of it, and the kings of the earth bring their glory and honor into it.*"—Rev. xxi. 23, 24. Can anything be more manifest than that the risen saints, represented by the city, are of a wholly different class from the nations of the saved who are to walk in their light? An equally broad distinction is made between them—verses 2–4, of the same chapter. The New Jerusalem descending from God out of heaven, is called by voices from the skies, "the tabernacle of God with men," and it is declared that he "shall dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, their God, and shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away." Here men, mankind, with whom God is to dwell, and whom he is to free from death, sorrow, crying, and pain, are a wholly different class from "the bride, the Lamb's wife," v. 9, symbolized by the holy city New Jerusalem, and called *his tabernacle with men*. And that their condition is to be essentially different is indicated also, chap. xxii. 1, 2, in which it is predicted that "the leaves of the tree of life," which is to stand on the banks of the river of the water of life running through the midst of the street of the city, "*are for the healing of the nations.*" If those nations are, as you suppose, "placed in the same category" as "the risen dead," as to the condition of their nature, how is it that they can still need healing by the leaves of the tree of life? You cannot hold that the risen saints are, notwithstanding the incorruptibleness, glory, and power, in which they are to be raised,—to be subject to disease of body, or any other defect that is to make the reception of a healing vegetable, or any analogous remedy necessary. There is a like distinction, also, Dan. vii., between the "all people, nations, and languages" who are to be the subjects of the kingdom with which Christ is to be invested at his coming in the clouds, and the saints of the Most High who are then to take the kingdom; that is, take kingly authority in it, in place of the rulers denoted by the ten-horned beast, who are then to be destroyed. Those who are to take the kingdom,—in other words, receive and exercise kingly authority in it—are not the people, nations, and languages who are to serve in it. That were to confound the monarch with the subject; those who exercise authority, with those over whom it is to be exercised. If they are all kings, how can they be each other's subjects? The continuance of men in the natural life at that period, is indicated also in many other passages.

The doctrine then that there are to be two classes of human beings

on the earth during the millennium, is not an error. It is plainly taught in the Scriptures. It was the faith of nearly the whole church during the two centuries that followed the death of the apostle John. It ever has been and now is the faith of millenarians generally. And why, with these plain testimonies of the word of God to that great feature of the millennial dispensation, should it be doubted? It certainly cannot be shown to be impossible. It cannot be shown, so far as I am aware, to involve any incompatibility with the nature of either class, or with any doctrine of the divine word. Were it revealed that angels, and in immense numbers, were to reign on the earth with Christ, you probably would not see any physical objection to it. You, doubtless, believe that multitudes, probably a countless host, of angels, good and evil, have visited the earth, and have exerted, and are now exerting important agencies here. Yet their presence has not proved incompatible with the continued life, the multiplication, nor the convenience of men. They have not crowded them so as to produce the effect of an over population. And how can it be shown that the risen saints, whose bodies are to be spiritual, will any more prove incompatible with the continued life of men in the natural body, or interfere with them by occupying the space they will need, and thereby diminishing the capacity of the earth to hold and sustain them?

As you are thus undoubtedly in an error in denying that men are then to exist in the natural life, and in nations, after Christ comes and establishes the New Jerusalem dispensation, you are of consequence in error in the conclusions you draw from it, and mistakenly ascribe to me. You say, "We had never obtained from the Scriptures, nor from Mr. Lord's Journal, any idea of another branch of Adam's race which is to remain on the earth, to exemplify redemption in a lower form, and to multiply children of God by *natural regeneration*; producing sons of God that are born of blood, and of the will of the flesh, and of the will of man, but not of God; and preparing to fill heaven with a race of redeemed, but not regenerate, and not pardoned, and not able to sing to him who had washed them from sin." It is apparent from the mode in which you present these remarks, that you regard what you thus depict, as the natural and inevitable consequence of the doctrine that men are to continue in the natural life and have offspring during the reign of the saints on the earth; and your representation is virtually at least, and meant to be so understood by your readers, that I hold and teach what you exhibit as involved in that doctrine. But in this, first, you do me the greatest injustice. I have never avowed any such sentiments. Point, if you can, to a syllable that has proceeded from my pen that has any such meaning. I have never uttered a word that can, by any process, be

tortured into an utterance of them. If you think them legitimate consequences of the doctrine I maintain, whether I see them to be such or not, you should have presented them in *that* attitude; not exhibited them as consequences which I recognise and avow.

But next, as the doctrine I maintain, but you reject, that men and nations are to exist on the earth in the natural life, and multiply, after Christ comes, is indisputably the doctrine of the Scriptures, and as the consequences therefore which you enumerate, do not follow from it, at least, in my judgment; it results that it is you alone, not I, that are chargeable with implying that the measures of the divine administration must issue in those consequences; and it is you alone accordingly, that are to meet the difficulties that representation involves; and I cannot but think you will find it a serious task. How can you prove that if offspring are born after Christ's second coming, they must any more be "children of God by natural regeneration," than those were who were born during his presence on earth after his first advent? How can you prove that the presence of the risen and glorified saints on the earth is to produce that effect, any more than the presence of Moses and Elias did when on Mount Tabor; or any more than the presence of the holy angels has during the ministries they have exercised on the earth from age to age? It is plain that your premise is no basis whatever for your conclusion.

In the third place, you manifestly assume that the saints who are living at the coming of Christ, will immediately be changed to a nature or state like that of the risen saints; that is, that the resurrection of the holy dead, and the change of the holy living, will take place at the same moment, or without any considerable space intervening between them. That is, undoubtedly, however, mistaken. It is expressly stated by Paul, 1 Thess. iv. 17, that the change of the living is to be subsequent to (*εὐσεία*, afterwards), not contemporaneous with the resurrection. It is taught, 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52, that the change of the living is to be wrought instantaneously, but not that it is to take place in the same instant as the resurrection of the dead. The blast of the last trumpet, during which both are to occur, is not to be limited to a moment or an hour, but is to extend over a very considerable period, as you will see is indicated, Rev. xi. 15-19, by the numerous and great events that are to take place under it, viz.: the assumption of the sovereignty of the world by Christ, the infliction of his wrath on his enemies, the resurrection of the holy dead, the reward of all the saints, living as well as dead, and the destruction of the great corrupters, or false religionists and tyrants of the earth. These last, undoubtedly, from the description of them, chap. xviii. and xix., are to occupy a considerable period. The resurrection of the holy dead is to take place, there is reason to

believe, Rev. xix. 2-9, after the overthrow of Babylon, and before the destruction of the beast and false prophet; as it is shown (v. 14) that the risen saints are to come with Christ, at the great battle in which the beast and his armies are to perish; and it is foreshown, also, Zech. xiv. 5, that at that crisis all the saints are to come with him; and that a period will pass, and probably of some length, after Christ raises the saints, before the living will be changed, is indicated in many passages. They are to be judged before they receive their reward. How can it be supposed that their judgment, as represented Matt. xxv., can take place in a moment?

In the fourth place, you assume that all who are not destroyed at Christ's coming, are to be saints, who are to be changed at once to glory. That, however, you will see, if the foregoing views are correct, is a mistake. How are they to continue as "people, nations, and languages," if they are all to be changed immediately to the condition of the risen saints? How are the Israelites, Isaiah lrv., to build and plant, and bear offspring, after the creation of the new heaven and new earth, if they are changed at once to spiritual bodies? How are the nations to require healing by the leaves of the tree of life, and need the light of the new Jerusalem to walk by, if they are themselves members of the body denoted by the new Jerusalem? But it is expressly indicated, Isaiah lxvi. 15-19, that notwithstanding the great slaughter of the wicked that is to take place at Christ's coming, some of all nations and tongues are still to survive; that some who are exposed to that slaughter, but escape, are to be sent to various nations, that, so far from having already been converted, will not have even heard the name of Jehovah, neither seen his glory, and that they will declare his glory among the Gentiles. It is foreshown, also, Zechariah xii., that it is to be after Christ's coming, and destruction of the antichristian hosts assembled against Jerusalem, that the spirit of grace and supplication is to be poured out upon the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and they are to be brought to a recognition of Christ as their Messiah, and are to repent and obtain forgiveness. It is expressly predicted, also, Rev. xv. 3, 4, that it is under the infliction of the last plagues, the chief of which are to take place under the last trumpet, that all nations are to be made to come and worship Jehovah, because his judgments are made manifest. Instead of the destruction, therefore, of all who are not sanctified at the moment of Christ's advent, the great work of the conversion of the nations is to take place after he comes. This—if the Scriptures are to decide the point—does not admit of any debate. The prophecies everywhere represent the antichristian party as triumphant, and evil of every sort as abounding, till Christ comes. There is not a

hint that the nations are to be generally brought to the faith and obedience of the gospel anterior to his advent and institution of his kingdom in the form in which it is to exist under his personal reign.

And finally, you assume that, if mankind continue during that period to have offspring, there must, of necessity, be a continual accession to the number of those who are in the natural life, and therefore at length an overcrowding of the earth with population. But that does not follow. It would be the result, doubtless, if no change of the living saints was to take place to a higher life. But as such a change is to take place, by which those who are the subjects of it will probably become like the risen saints, spiritual in their bodies, and thereby no longer interfere with the living by occupying space that is needful for them, any more than the angels now do, the consequence you suppose cannot necessarily result from the continued birth of offspring. If, after the earth is sufficiently peopled, the transfiguration of the living takes place as rapidly as the births—the number of those in the natural life, instead of perpetually augmenting, will remain stationary.

Such are my views. They seem to me adequate answers to your difficulties, and to supersede the necessity of a notice of the other topics to which you refer. I close, therefore, and am respectfully and sincerely yours,

D. N. LORD.

NEW YORK, 9th August, 1854.

This letter Dr. Cooke declined to insert in the *Recorder*. His desire "to get relief to our own wonder," appears, on the perusal of it, to have undergone a sudden syncope, and not improbably from the apprehension, that instead of his making us the object of ridicule by the discussion, the astonishment and laughter of the public were likely to be turned upon himself. The position which he occupies is certainly a very awkward one.

1. On the ground of a peculiar and false notion of the state of men, after Christ comes, which he holds and we reject, he charges us with teaching what implies that the glorified saints are to have offspring. It is his *own notion* that all mankind are then to be "placed in the same category," by the change of the living to the same state as the risen saints, that he makes the ground of his imputation; not the view *we* entertain of the condition in which those of

the race living at Christ's advent are then to be placed—which wholly precludes the consequence he endeavors to fasten on the doctrine we maintain. This is certainly a very extraordinary proceeding. The question whether the consequence for which he attempts to make us responsible, follows on the notion *he* entertains of the state of men after Christ comes, is wholly different from the question whether it follows on the *directly opposite view of it which we hold*. Yet Dr. Cooke treats these questions as though they were the same, and undertakes to make us responsible for the results of his false theory, which we reject! Was there ever injustice that transcended this? If, as we hold, men are to continue in the natural body, and have offspring after Christ comes, it surely does not follow that the glorified saints are also to have offspring. Dr. Cooke, accordingly, charges us with implying that the glorified saints are to have offspring, *because he holds*, in direct contradiction to us, that none of the race are then to exist in the natural life, but that *all are* to be glorified! What a piercing perspicacity he displays! What a delightful exemption from everything like confused and muddy conceptions! What irrefragable logic! The only apology he presents for this singular injustice is, that *he did not know* that we held that men are to continue in the natural life after Christ comes. That he did not know what our views are—if it be a fact—was a good reason for his not attempting to make them the object of prejudice, but is the poorest of all possible reasons for misrepresenting them. If he did not know what they are, why did he assume that they are obnoxious to the objection which he alleges against them? Would he accept such an apology from one who grossly misrepresented him? Had the editor of the *Independent*, who some time since made a representation which he thought highly injurious to his character, offered it as a justification of himself, that *he did not know* that Dr. Cooke is an upright and honorable man, would he have regarded it as a satisfactory answer? We presume not. Yet it would have been precisely parallel to the reason he gives for his misrepresentation of us.

2. In like manner he makes *his own peculiar false notion* in regard to what is to take place after Christ comes—not the view we entertain, the ground of the charge that our

view implies that the earth is to be immeasurably over-populated—that the number who are to be called into existence, and compelled to live here, will boundlessly transcend the capacity of the globe to accommodate them. We maintain that though men continue to propagate, and are not to be removed by death, they yet will not overcrowd the earth, because they will successively be transformed to a higher nature, like that, probably, of the risen saints, and be prevented thereby from occupying the space that is needful for those who continue in the natural body. Dr. Cooke, however, does not believe in the transfiguration of any saints except those who are living on the earth at the time of Christ's advent, and holds, therefore, that if men continue in the natural life, and propagate, and yet are not removed by death, as all that come into existence must continue here in the natural body, the number will at length reach and transcend the capacity of the earth to sustain them. It is *his own notion*, thus, which he makes the ground of his accusation against us, not the view we maintain, which specifically precludes the consequence which he charges on it!

3. The want of acquaintance with the subject which he displays, is very far from being creditable to him. It seems he does not know that it is the belief of millenarians generally, that men are to continue in the natural life after Christ comes, and that it is after his advent that the conversion of the nations is to take place! It appears, also, that he does not know that the Bible teaches that this world is to be the scene of the kingdom Christ is to establish at his second coming, and to reign over for ever and ever. The express testimonies to that great purpose, with which the prophecies abound, appear never to have attracted his attention. How much better would it have been, if, instead of endeavoring "to get relief to his wonder," at difficulties which he falsely ascribes to the doctrines of millenarianism, he had employed himself in ascertaining what those doctrines are, and examining and receiving the Scriptural grounds on which they rest?

4. In our first letter we state, in answer to his second "difficulty," that his "objection is as applicable to the scheme which would have been pursued had man not fallen, as it is



to that which is to be instituted when the curse of the fall is repealed ;" since, as he "doubtless will admit, if man had not fallen, he would have continued to reside in this world and to multiply, at least to the present time ;" and that at any rate a time would have come, and probably "long since, when the number of the race would have reached the utmost capacity of the earth to accommodate them ;" and that some method would have been provided to exempt them from that evil.

This he attempts to set aside by denying that there is any certainty, had they not fallen, that they would have multiplied to any greater number than simply to "fill" the capacity of the earth to sustain them. This denial involves consequences, however, we apprehend, of which he is but little aware. The number which the race has already reached, is held by persons who have investigated the subject, to be at least sixty or seventy thousand millions ; a crowd several times, probably fifteen, perhaps twenty times greater than could contemporaneously subsist on the earth. Dr. C.'s denial implies, therefore, that had man not fallen, the number of the race that would then have had a being, would have been immensely less than have already come into existence. But this implies, that if Adam had not fallen, all those of the race now existing beyond the number who could subsist together on the earth, would never have had an existence. But this again implies that if he had not fallen, he would not have acted in his trial as the head and representative of that part of the present race who then would have had no being ; and this implies, we take it, that he did not in fact act as their representative at all. For if he did not act as their head and representative in the obedient part of his representative agency, which preceded his transgression, how can it be held that he acted as their representative in his fall ? Does Dr. Cooke hold, that the individuals of the race who would have existed if Adam had not fallen, are identically the same as those who actually exist, up to the number who he supposes would then have come into being ? Or does he hold that they would have been a wholly different set of individuals ? If he holds that they would have been the same specific persons up to the supposed number, and that Adam acted as their representative in the obedient agency

which he exerted up to the moment of his fall, as well as in that transgression, how can he deny that he acted in his whole agency, obedient as well as sinful, as the representative of all the others of the race that have come into existence, as much as of that supposed number? If he holds that the persons who would have come into existence, if Adam had continued in allegiance, would have been specifically different from those that actually exist, then he implies that those whom Adam represented in his agency up to the moment of his transgression *have never come into existence*, and are not to at any future period; *and yet that Adam did not subject them to any forfeiture by his transgression*; for how could his fall subject them to any forfeiture, if he did not act in it as their representative? They have lost an immortal existence of holiness and blessedness, it seems, by his fall, *and yet have not suffered any forfeiture by it!* We might trace the consequences of Dr. C.'s denial still further, but this is sufficient to indicate the issues to which it leads. In what a pretty batch of difficulties has he involved himself in his attempt "to get relief to his wonder," at the implications of his own absurd notions, which he falsely ascribes to us!

5. And, finally, after having published his groundless accusations, and repeated them in a measure in his second article, he had not the fairness to present to his readers our second letter, in which his errors are so clearly pointed out as to make it unsafe to repeat the misrepresentation. In this we think he was injudicious, as well as unjust. After having protested that he presented "this difficulty, not in a spirit of captious criticism, but to get relief to our own wonder;" and expressed his "wonder what way Mr. Lord has devised to escape a difficulty so fatal to his theory; or if he has devised none" his "wonder that he should not, after all his profound investigations, have seen a difficulty so obvious and yet so fatal to his theory;" he should, without hesitation, have let his readers know in full what the answer is which we make to his objections. How can he now suppose that those who know that he refused to publish the second letter, will give credit to his representation that his object was—not to excite prejudice against us—but to get information in regard to our views? In what other way can they so naturally account for his not inserting that letter, as by presuming that it

sprung from an unwillingness that his readers should see in what an unfortunate predicament he has placed himself?

We insert the letters in the Journal, and make these remarks, that our readers may see to what expedients a class of antimillenarians resort to prejudice their readers against us, and throw discredit on the great Scriptural doctrine we maintain of Christ's premillennial coming and reign with his saints over "all people, nations, and languages" on the earth. Was ever a more captious, uncandid, and dishonorable course pursued? They wholly refuse to try the question between us by the word of God. They appear as averse to look at what the Bible teaches on the subject as ever Catholics were to try their doctrines by that standard. Instead of an upright and thorough trial of the doctrines of millenarianism by the Scriptures, they prefer to confine themselves to offering objections that have their origin in their own false notions; or else in gross and inexcusable misrepresentations of those whom they assail. This does not indicate an undoubting conviction of the truth of their theories and conscious ability to vindicate them by fair means. It is the mark rather of an uncandid and a baffled adversary.

May God forgive them, imbue them with a better spirit, discover to them the error in which they are involved, and lead them to the full knowledge and joyous reception of his truth.

---

ART. X.—LITERARY AND CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. THE MILLENNIUM: An Essay read to the General Convention of New Hampshire, June, 1853, by Nathan Lord, President of Dartmouth College. Dartmouth Press, Hanover, 1854.

THIS ESSAY, which was prepared at the request of the clerical body before which it was delivered, is a comprehensive, calm, and impressive statement of the doctrine of the Scriptures, as it is held by millenarians, respecting Christ's second coming, the great events that are to attend the institution of his millennial kingdom on the earth, and the characteristics that are to distinguish the thousand years of

his reign. The author begins by stating that millenarianism is not, as some of its rejecters represent, a mere speculative theory, or creation of the fancy, but a Scriptural doctrine, a revelation made in the most specific forms, and occupying a large part of the sacred word.

"I know no *theory* of millenarianism, properly so called; and I know no modern, in distinction from ancient millenarianism. This, like other doctrines of Scripture, for a long time held by the primitive Christians, was corrupted at length by rationalistic and fanciful interpreters, led by Origen and other speculative theologians of the schools. Through the middle ages it was mostly covered up by scholastic traditions, allegorical commentaries, and the errors of Romanism in general. Occasionally, excited men, who caught amid the surrounding darkness some glimpses of the primitive truth, attempted to revive it. But they could not re-produce it in its simplicity. The age was too dark. Providence was not ready for them. They brought out only obscure resemblances of it, mere caricatures, which disgusted all considerate persons, and served only to perpetuate the popular delusions. These extravagances are reported in all the histories down to the Reformation.

"The same has been true, to a great extent, of the latter half of the Protestant period. The reformers in general returned, in this respect, as in others, to the primitive belief. Some of their ablest writers gave it their unequivocal testimony and support. But they were pressed by subjects of more immediate concernment to church and state, and could not conveniently elaborate this, which, as they foresaw and testified, would belong more intimately to a future, and as some affirmed, our present period. It was suffered to fall off again, for the most part, into the hands of the speculative and curious, who have used it rather as a theme for the exercise of a romantic ingenuity, or for giving currency and effect to popular delusions. Till of late, there has been but little scientific inquiry into those laws of prophetic interpretation, by which alone the meaning of Scripture, and the orthodoxy of the primitive ages, in this respect could be re-established. The consequence has been a deluge of extravagant pernicious millennial literature, from Burnet and Whiston all round to Whitby and his modern imitators, and the school of Miller, among the interpreters; and among the revealers, from Swedenborg to Ann Lee, and the Latter Day Saints of Utah. The Protestant conceits have as far exceeded the flights of mediæval novelists, as mental activity, and freedom of inquiry, have been greater since the Reformation.

"But millenarianism, to a careful and conscientious student, who affects no intuition knowledge of the Divine counsels, and submits not to human authority in matters of faith, is perfectly distinguishable

ble from those speculative curiosities. It is as susceptible of scientific interpretation from Scripture in its order, as any of the truths that orthodox Christians have accepted since the days of the Apostles. It is no more exceptionable, on account of the misrepresentations and abuses of it by foolish men, than the Trinity, or atonement, or a future state in general."

After stating the main points of millenarianism, contrasting them with the opposite system, showing that they are deduced from the Scriptures by the same principles of interpretation as the other great doctrines of the sacred word are, that they form a consistent and essential part of that great scheme of administration over the world which all evangelical believers admit and firmly hold is revealed in the Bible, and that they are in harmony with the great features of God's sway hitherto, and the exhibitions that have taken place under it, of the heart of man; he urges that we are bound to take the teachings of the Scriptures on the subject, interpreted by their proper laws, as presenting the real revelation God has made respecting it; not by a false method of interpretation to set them aside, and substitute a different doctrine in their place.

"We have no right to conclude or imagine, against the ordinary laws of language, the rules of logic, the analogies of history, and the general course and tendency of events, that his distinct and literal declarations may be subjected to a mythical interpretation; or that he will act in his future government, contrarily to the methods which he has certainly observed in the past." . . .

"On the contrary, to set up our speculations and theories of a millennium in distinction from these logical, inductive, and historical conclusions, or in opposition to them, and to put, accordingly, an allegorical and mythical interpretation upon the holy Scriptures, as the modern churches have done, for the last hundred and fifty years, and are now doing, in accordance with the merely imaginative and fictitious philosophies of the schools, is infinitely dishonorable to the word of God, and dangerous to the souls of men. The curious, romantic, discordant, and mostly unintelligible literature, which, on this and other related subjects of the Bible, has now spread itself from the great centres of theological instruction over the whole Christian world, and has nearly superseded the primitive and reformed theology, and has controlled the social and political movements of the nations, producing the agitations, destructions, and confusions which now exist, is derogatory to the honor of Jesus Christ, and is the most remarkable sign of the predicted apostasy of the last times. . . .

"Those rationalistic and spiritualizing principles and methods of interpretation which would practically nullify the doctrine of the mil-

lenarians, though they could not affect its Scriptural reality, would, if consistently carried out, and applied to other doctrines of the Bible, as professed by orthodox Christians in general, and embodied in their standards and formulas of faith from the beginning, in like manner nullify these received doctrines; *reduce the whole of Scripture to a myth*; the churches and their subsidiary institutions to mere academies and schools of philosophy; the preachers to masters of dialectics, disputers of science, *visionary reformers, theatrical declaimers, or political agitators*; and the people in general to *ignorance, indifference, frivolity, infidelity, licentiousness, and anarchy*. This tendency is already remarkable to a considerable extent throughout the Christian world, in connexion with such rationalistic and spiritualising principles and methods: and without a revival of the millenarian faith, and of the primitive doctrines in general, by a return to the simple verities of Scripture, this tendency will become effect more extensively, and consummate the predicted apostasy of the last days; and that such results are inevitable, because the governing principles of interpretation of any age, or any institution of learning or religion, must, by a natural law, at length govern their methods of ethical and theological reasoning, and the creeds and articles of belief in which their ethics and theology are embodied, and consequently their whole practical life. . . . And the most appalling evidence of this growing tendency and effect is the prevailing apathy and unconcern of the churches and ministers of Christ, in respect to his second coming and personal reign upon the earth; and the cold reserve, or feverish jealousy, or sneering contemptuousness, or proud disdain, or peevish fretfulness, or sideway thrusts, or flat hostility of most or many persons, both within and without the visible church of Christ, and on the part of the secular and religious press in general, to which those honest and faithful men are now subjected, who testify, in their sincerity, to this and other related facts and verities of the Word of God."

We rejoice that so clear and emphatic a statement of the doctrines of millenarianism, and the grounds on which they rest, has been presented by Dr. Lord to the Congregational ministers of New Hampshire. Misleading as the influence is of false notions, deep as prejudices are, there are some among them, we hope there are many, who will read it with attention, and be led by it to a juster estimate of the claims of the subject to their careful study. It is such a presentation of the theme as is eminently needed. The attacks by antimillenarians on the doctrines of millenarians, and the principles of interpretation by which they deduce them from the Scriptures, in the *Quarterlies* and other publications during the last five or six years, have issued very unfortunately for the cause of their authors. Instead of

confuting millenarianism, they have only confuted and confounded themselves by showing that they were involved in the most deplorable misapprehension both of the system which they attacked and that which they maintained; and were wholly unacquainted with the principles of interpretation by which the question, what the real teachings are of the Scriptures on the subject, is to be determined. The result was that great numbers of their own party lost faith in a great measure in their method of treating the Scriptures that foreshow the great purposes of God respecting the future government of the world, and become satisfied that, as a preliminary to all other questions, the validity of the laws of symbols and figures that have been advanced in the *Journal*, needs to be thoroughly tried and determined, and that the issue is to depend on their verification or overthrow; that if they are sustained, antimillenarianism falls, and for ever; and that even apart from the question of their truth, it is convicted of such enormous errors and self-contradictions as to render its advocacy, without the most important modifications, utterly hopeless. The controversy is consequently suspended for the present, and attention is turned to the laws of interpretation, and the results to which they lead. What is now chiefly needed, accordingly, is a plain, full, and bold statement of the doctrine of the Scriptures, as it is understood by millenarians, respecting Christ's coming and reign; an exhibition of the principles of symbolization and figurative language, by which that doctrine is shown to be the real and indubitable teaching of the sacred word; and a clear and convincing statement of the false principles on which antimillenarians build their constructions of the prophecies, and demonstration of the error of their speculative scheme. Every upright and energetic effort made in this direction, is likely, we believe, to prove effective in a higher measure than at any former period. The number of readers is far greater. They are much less under the sway of sinister prepossessions and party prejudices. They have far less faith in the confident and violent opponents of the doctrine of Christ's reign on the earth; they have less confidence in their own inherited belief; and they are far more sensible of the importance of the question, and desirous of a just understanding of it. There are not a few antimillenarians, we have reason to believe, from whose lips prayer daily ascends to God for guidance to a true knowledge of the purposes he has revealed respecting the redemption of the world, and who are struggling to escape from the labyrinth of error and darkness in which the false teachings under which they were reared, have involved them, into the light of unclouded day. Let millenarians then avail themselves of this juncture to proclaim the faith which they hold, and the laws of language and symbols by which its truth is demonstrated. No summons to a great duty was ever more

urgent. To shun it, to shut their lips in silence, to stand dumb spectators of the strife, and leave those whom God has placed within their influence to go on in error and delusion instead of acting the part of witnesses, were to desert the cause of Christ and join the ranks of his enemies. Let each one, then, in the sphere in which providence has placed him, testify to the truth as it is in Jesus, and trust in him to give it efficacy by his Spirit. He will own the faithful labors of his disciples, and connect with them, not improbably, as he has in other crises of the church, trains of consequences far transcending in greatness and joyfulness their largest anticipations, their most ardent hopes.

**2. ODD-FELLOWSHIP, examined in the Light of Scripture and Reason,** by Joseph P. Cooper, Pastor of the Second Associate Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. Philadelphia: William S. Young. 1853.

THESE lectures, which were originally delivered by Dr. Cooper to his congregation, are designed to dissuade his hearers and readers from connecting themselves with the societies whose object and character he delineates, on the ground that they are neither Christian nor charitable associations, but antagonistic to the church, unrefined, deceptive, and exerting a pernicious influence on those who place themselves under their sway. He derives his information chiefly from their own volumes, presents the grounds for his representations with candor, and urges his objections with the fairness and fidelity that become a Christian minister.

**3. LECTURES ON ROMANISM.** Being Illustrations and Refutations of the Errors of Romanism and Tractarianism. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D., Minister of the Scottish National Church, Crown Court, Covent Garden, London. Boston: J. P. Jewett & Co. Cleveland, Ohio: Jewett, Proctor, & Worthington. 1854.

DR. CUMMING is rendering an important service to the Protestants of Great Britain and this country, by the efforts he is making to rouse them to a sense of the danger with which they are threatened by the attempts of the Catholic church to spread its false doctrines, and recover its lost power to enforce its dogmas on the nations. Until recently, the subject had lost its interest with the public generally; the belief prevailed that the Papacy was smitten with helpless decrepitude, and would sink into extinction; and the true character of its doctrines, and the schemes with which its priests are busied, be-



came, in a great measure, unknown even to the intelligent and cultivated. The recent attempts, however, of the Papists to recover their former sway in Great Britain, the aim which they everywhere reveal of grasping absolute dominion over men, and the disposition they have exhibited to persecute dissentients, wherever they have had the power, have shown that their principles and their purposes are as hostile to the political and religious freedom of the nation, as in any former age, and indicated the necessity of a renewed attention by the Protestants to their doctrines and their policy. Dr. Cumming is excellently fitted for this task, by his highly popular talent as a preacher, his ample learning, and the fairness, good temper, and superiority to prejudice and party feeling, for which he is distinguished; and his labors, already exerting a wide influence, may not improbably prove of far higher moment than is now generally imagined, in preparing the people of God in Great Britain for the struggle in which they are ere long to be involved with Rome as a domineering and persecuting power.

This volume, of upwards of seven hundred pages, and consisting chiefly of lectures, treats of the main principles and doctrines of the Papacy; such as the arrogation by the Pope of absolute authority over Christianity itself and the church; the sworn allegiance to him of all Catholic ecclesiastics, and engagement to persecute and exterminate all dissentients from her communion; and the Catholic doctrine of tradition, apostolical succession, purgatory, invocation of saints, transubstantiation, and the mass. These and the other leading features of that great mystery of iniquity, Dr. Cumming has depicted with a bold and graphic hand. The monster is beheld by the reader in its living colors, and hideous as its hues are, with the conviction that they proceeded from the pencil of truth. And the discussion, sprightly and vivacious throughout, and often rising to eloquence, is graced frequently with sparkling figures, glittering shafts of wit, and brilliant flashes of fancy, and adorned with lofty thoughts and generous and noble sentiments. We wish the volume may be read not merely for the pleasure it may afford, but more for the information, greatly needed, which it gives of that malignant power that is marshalling its forces for a bloody war on the followers of the Lamb.

4. RELIGIOUS MAXIMS, having a connexion with the Doctrines and Practice of Holiness. By T. C. Upham, D.D. Second edition, with additions. Philadelphia: William S. Martien. 1854.

THESE MAXIMS, instead of brief sentences, or terse rules of conduct, are statements of truth, counsels, expressions of sentiment, delineations

tions of religious affections, and recommendations of a holy life, and are highly pleasing. They are employed chiefly in defining and urging the duty of faith in God, submission to his providential appointments, humility, gentleness, forgiveness, prayer, watchfulness, love, and the study of the sacred word, and are suited to yield instruction and pleasure to readers of all classes. Religion is exhibited in them as a great and sublime reality, that has its seat in the heart, and its principal reference to God; not, as many seem to imagine, a mere matter of speculation, or having its chief sphere in external actions.

5. **CHRIST'S ASCENSION.** Its Truth and its Worth. A Sermon preached at St. John's Church, Cincinnati, May 28, 1854. By the Rev. Wm. R. Nicholson, Rector.

THIS discourse presents an earnest statement of the great doctrine of the Scriptures of Christ's ascension to the right hand of the Majesty on high; his exercise, there, of the government of the universe during the present dispensation over this world, under which his enemies are allowed to wage war against him and his people; and his speedy return and assumption of the sceptre of the earth, and the conversion of the nations that is to follow, and continuance of the work of redemption throughout his everlasting reign.

6. **THE TWINS;** or, Conversations on the Importance of the Office of Ruling Elder. Philadelphia: W. S. Martien. 1854.

THE dialogue on the importance, authority, and duties of the eldership, which occupies the chief part of this little work, and presents a very full view of that subject, though specially designed for members of the church, is interwoven with a domestic story, which relieves and enlivens the discussion, and adapts it to interest other classes of readers.

7. **SYMBOLIC PROPHECY.** Remarks on an Exposition of the Apocalypse, by D. N. Lord. No. II. By an Inquirer. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1854.

THE object of this pamphlet, under the same title as one noticed in the last number of the Journal, is to show the importance of the

laws of symbolization, by the results to which they lead in the interpretation of the Apocalypse. The writer selects for the purpose, the symbols of the sixth vial, which, construed by those laws, present a wholly different revelation from that which is ordinarily ascribed to them. The interpretation given of them in the *Exposition and Journal* is quoted at some length; and the indications pointed out that the prediction is receiving its fulfilment, in a measure, in the present alienation of the people of France, Spain, Italy, and Germany, from the national hierarchies, especially of the Catholic church.

8. *A DEFENCE OF THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH*, by its author, being a rejoinder to Professor Newman's Reply; also, a Reply to the Eclipse of Faith, by Francis W. Newman, together with a chapter on the Moral Perfection of Jesus, reprinted from the *Phases of Faith*. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. New York: Evans & Dickerson. 1854.

MR. NEWMAN'S reply to the Eclipse of Faith, which occupies the first pages of this volume, is entitled to the elaborate answer it has here received, not on the ground of any merits, but solely because of its enormous obliquities. It is marked by a meanness of artifice, a boldness of misrepresentation, and an effrontery of abuse that exemplify, very strikingly, the debasement to which they often sink, who apostatize from the Christian faith, and are led by their pride, ambition of conspicuity, and resentment at the confutation of their errors, to assail with a wanton malice the truths they once received, and endeavor to overwhelm them with accusations and ridicule. None but a mind extremely blunted in its moral sensibilities, corroded by evil passions, and eager to display its recklessness, could have given birth to such an assault on Christ's character, as Mr. Newman entitles "The Moral Perfection of Jesus." The response he has received, though studiously forbearing, is amply thorough and caustic, and must give large occupation to his "susceptibility of shame," if any trace of that sensibility subsists in his nature. A more overwhelming exposure of mean subterfuges, daring mis-statements, and impudent traduction, is not often seen. The impossibility of escaping the difficulties Mr. Newman makes the ground of his rejection of revelation, by retreating to deism, which acknowledges God's permission or ordering by his providence over the world, of events of the same class as those objected to in the Scriptures, is set forth in a very demonstrative light; and the duty enforced of

distrusting man, whom we know to be ignorant and weak, instead of doubting and impeaching God, who is infinite in intelligence, in power, and in goodness.

9. THE BRITISH PERIODICALS; Republished by L. Scott & Co.

THE Quarterlies for July and August, though without any articles of special brilliance, present a great array, and on themes of interest, that are marked by learning and ability. Those on the Eastern war furnish much useful information respecting the political, social, and religious condition of the nations occupying the territory around the Black Sea, and immediately embroiled in the conflict; and indicate the feeling that the Western states cannot safely close the contest with Russia, until she is deprived of the power of encroaching on the Turkish empire; and that ere that result is reached, a long and violent struggle will probably prove necessary. The articles on the condition of the laboring classes in Great Britain, emigration, and the state of the colonies in South Africa and Australia, are highly instructive. The London Quarterly, under the head of Christianity in Melanesia and New Zealand, presents a very interesting view of the missions in those regions. The literary articles are of but slight value. The attempt, in the North British—following in the steps of the Westminster and Blackwood—to attract attention to Arnold's poems, and convert him, by advice, into a writer of taste, indicates that poetry has fallen to a very low condition in Great Britain.

10. THE OLD AND THE NEW; or the Changes of Thirty Years in the East, with some allusions to Oriental Customs as elucidating Scripture. By William Goodell, Missionary in Constantinople, with an Introduction by W. Adams, D.D. New York: M. W. Dodd, 1853.

THIS volume presents a vivid picture of the manners and religion of the people of the East, the difficulties with which the missionaries have had to contend, and the successes with which their labors have been crowned. The delineation it presents of the extinction in the minds both of the teachers and the taught of that region, of the very conception of spiritual religion, and conversion of piety into a mere system of rites and ceremonies, is very striking, and exemplifies the great doctrine of the Scriptures, that it is through the truth,

and the truth only, that the Spirit sanctifies men. He does not dwell with those who reject or neglect the great realities of the work of redemption. He does not associate his renewing and sanctifying influences with gross errors, and the commandments of men; and give them to occupy the place as instruments, which belongs only to his word. Instead, he leaves them to work out their natural results, and show by their issues the contrast which they form to the righteousness and wisdom of his truth.

The way appears to be open, by the toleration now granted by the Turkish government, for a rapid spread of the gospel in the East; and there is reason to expect that a crowd of true disciples will be raised up to utter their witness for the truth in the great conflict with the antichristian powers which is approaching.

11. *THE CHARACTERISTICS AND LAWS OF FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE.*  
By D. N. Lord. New York: Franklin Knight. 1854. Pp. 306.

It is known to many readers of the Journal that we have been designing to publish a volume on this subject for Bible classes, schools, and colleges. It is to be issued during the month. The following passage from the Preface indicates its object and character:—

“The several figures are here minutely analysed; the particulars in which they differ from each other pointed out; the principles stated on which they are employed; the rules given by which their meaning is determined; and their characteristics and laws verified by a large variety of examples from the sacred writings and the poets.

“The subject will be found, by those who thoroughly study it, to be one of the finest in the whole circle of knowledge, both for the development and discipline of the intellect, and the evolution and refinement of the taste. The application of the characteristics and laws to the identification and interpretation of the figures of the sacred word, though after practice involving little difficulty, requires close and discriminative attention; and the perception of the analogies on which they are founded, and the delicate graces with which they are fraught, is eminently adapted to unfold and quicken the sensibility to what is beautiful and grand, and imbue the taste with delicacy and elegance.”

THE  
THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY  
JOURNAL.

---

VOLUME VII.

JANUARY, 1855.

NUMBER III.

---

ART. I.—DR. HICKOK'S RATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY.

BY THE EDITOR.

PSYCHOLOGY, in its comprehensive sense, treats of the powers and operations of the mind, including the emotional and voluntary, as well as the perceptive. Rational Psychology treats only of its perceptive powers and operations, to the exclusion mainly of the emotional and voluntary; and its object is to determine what the different classes are of our perceptions and thoughts; what the faculties are in which those classes have their origin; what the laws are of those faculties, or of the perceptions and thoughts that originate in them; and by *à priori* or ascertained criteria, give to our knowledge the rank of a demonstrated science.

This mode of treating the subject was first introduced by Kant, about seventy years ago. His aim was to raise this branch of metaphysics out of the sphere of mere experience and induction, into that of demonstration, by ascertained facts and principles as certain and universal in respect to the mind, as the axioms and definitions of geometry are to that branch of knowledge; and he thought by that means to put an end—if his professions are to be received as

ingenuous—alike to materialism and idealism, atheism and scepticism. For that purpose, he maintained that space and time have no exterior reality, but are mere forms of thought, or conditions of certain phenomena of consciousness. He consequently held that the objects which appear in the senses—as those of sight, touch, taste—have no exterior and independent existence, but are merely subjective, or mental; and that it is owing altogether to the nature of the mind that they exist, and are what they are; not to the objective existence and action on the mind, through the organs of sense, of substances answering in any relation to our sense-perceptions. That some exterior thing acts on the organs, by contact or otherwise, and is the occasion or condition of the impression on the senses, he indeed admitted; but maintained that its nature and mode of agency are wholly unknown, and that it is owing, not at all to that invisible unknown cause, but exclusively to the mind itself, that the phenomena of the senses, or our sense-perceptions excited by that agent, are what they are. He accordingly denied that there are any perceptions of exterior objects by the senses, and held that there are but two perceptive faculties,—first, that which gives form to the seeming objects of the senses, and the thoughts that respect them—which he denominated the Understanding,—that which stands under them, and gives them their seeming reality and shape; which deals, therefore, only with the sensuous, which is circumscribed within the limits of space and time; and next, the Reason, which originates ideas that relate to immaterial existences, such as the soul and God, and therefore has its sphere out of the senses, and is called supersensuous.

As it is characteristic of all sense-perceptions and thoughts respecting them, as their objects are conceived by us, that they are within the sphere of space and time, he used that feature as a criterion of them; and aimed to demonstrate thereby, on the one hand, that no perception or thought, having its origin from the understanding, and dealing thence with seeming material substances, could rise out of that realm into the supersensuous, and have the soul or God for its object: and on the other, that no idea of the supersensuous, such as God or the soul, could have its origin in the understanding, but must be the product exclusively

of the reason. By this means he, on the one side, considered himself as able to confute the scepticism of Hume, who drew his doubt of the divine existence from the sphere of the senses and understanding. Holding, as he did, that there are but two sources of perceptions and ideas, the senses and the understanding, or mind reflecting on the impressions made on the senses, and acting in respect to them, he maintained from the fact that the impressions on the senses do not give a specific idea of cause, and from his theory that the mind in its subsequent acts respecting the perceptions by sense, cannot pass out of their sphere, that it has no knowledge whatever of a real, efficient cause, but only of the relation in time, or the antecedence and consequence, of seeming causes to their effects; and thence he denied the validity of the argument from the material and intellectual world as effects, to God as their cause. But this, Kant disproved, as he held, by showing that the argument is wholly irrelevant, God being supersensuous, and wholly, therefore, out of the sphere from which Hume drew his conclusion. The Divine Spirit being immaterial, the fact that he does not appear perceptibly to the senses, as a material substance, is no proof that he does not exist. He, on the other side, confuted also by the same method, he flattered himself, atheism and materialism, using the term to denote the objects, or seeming objects of the sense-perceptions. The ideas of God and the soul being above the sphere of the understanding, which deals only with things in the realms of space and time, they demonstrate, he held, that there is a species of knowledge that is above those realms, and therefore purely supersensuous and ideal. And finally, he drew from the sphere of the understanding a similar proof against universal idealism.

In denying, however, the reality of space, and the objects of our sense-perceptions, and making the mind itself the sole cause of the existence and nature of all its phenomena, he laid the foundation, on the one hand, for the subversion of the very truths which he aimed to establish, and on the other, for the establishment of the idealism and scepticism which he proposed to overthrow. For if all the objects of our sense-perceptions are merely subjective, or exist only in us, and as phenomena of the mind, and there is nothing exterior to us that answers to them,—then, first, they plainly



are merely ideal or conceptional existences: and next, as there is then no external universe, and no fellow creatures, there are no exterior media of a knowledge of God, and no means therefore of knowing that he exists, except by a direct intuition, which we are conscious does not lie within the sphere of our nature. His theory of space, time, and the objects of sense-perception accordingly led Fichte to demonstrate that, on that basis, there is no evidence of anything exterior to the mind, that is the occasion of the impressions on the organs of sense, but that all supposed and seeming substances without, are purely subjective; and that the material universe, therefore, and all its inhabitants, are altogether ideal. It prompted Schelling, on the other hand, to the pantheistic theory of the identity of object and subject; or that God the Absolute is the only being, and that material forms and finite intelligences are but the forms in which he unfolds and reveals himself. And finally, it led Hegel to the other phase of modern pantheism, that the object perceived, the perceiver, and the perception, are identically the same; or that there is neither any real material nor spiritual existence; but that thought and the act of thinking are identical, and constitute the only existence. Scepticism and atheism, in more absolute and impious forms than the world had ever before seen, were thus the results of Kant's system, and have spread over nearly the whole of continental Europe, and gained a wide prevalence in Great Britain and this country. Instead of disarming the enemies of religion, he put instruments into their hands that have proved vastly more efficacious against the truth than any that had before been wielded for its overthrow.

It is highly desirable, therefore, that a true rational Psychology should be constructed, that, by excluding the erroneous assumptions on which Kant proceeded, shall preclude the idealism and atheism to which his directly led, and the pantheism in which it at length terminated. Whoever shall elaborate such a system, and bring it, in intelligibleness and simplicity, within the sphere even of the educated, will render a very important service to the cause of learning and religion.

It is this which Dr. Hickok has professedly attempted to accomplish in his work. He rejects the atheistic systems

Hegel and Schelling, the idealism of Fichte, and seemingly some of the false assumptions of Kant in respect to space, time, and the objective world ; and admitting apparently, in words at least, the reality of space, and the objects of our sense-perceptions—aims to build a system of Psychology that, on the one hand, recognises and demonstrates the truth, and on the other, rejects and overturns the errors of the popular German Psychologists. We propose to state the method of his procedure, and consider to what extent his system is suited to answer the end for which he designs it. While he follows mainly in the track of Kant, derives from him his principles, his points, his arguments, and many of his illustrations, he seems nevertheless to have elaborated them very thoroughly. By seemingly rejecting Kant's false notions of the non-reality of space and the objects of our sense-perceptions, he would enable himself, if he adhered to that rejection, to escape the fatal tendencies with which Kant's system is fraught. He displays strong powers of discrimination and argument, and with the exception of the parts of his volume in which he employs a German vocabulary, uses a clear and manly style. The obscurity, however, which reigns through many of his pages is not owing altogether either to the intricacy of the subject, or to his employing Kant's technical terms, for which in the main English names and phrases might have been more advantageously used, but to the neglect of a sufficiently clear statement of the object at which he aims. But the book is made to be studied, not simply to be read ; the difficulties of the style may be overcome by a careful notice of the definitions that are given of the most important terms, and by translating them into equivalent English ; and when that obstacle is removed, and the principles of the system are gained, the volume will be found worthy of a thorough study. That those of our readers who are not familiar with Kant, may see in what a cloud of unusual and obscure words he wraps up his meaning, we present the following passage, which is far from being one of his most hieroglyphic and uninterpretable :

“ The highest principle of the possibility of all intuition, in relation to sensibility, was, according to the transcendental æsthetic, that all the diversity thereof stands under the formal conditions of space and

time. The highest principle of the same, in reference to the understanding, is, that all diversity of the intuition stands under the original synthetical unity of the apperception. Under the first case stand all the diverse representations of the intuitions, so far as they are given to us; under the second, so far as they must be able to be conjoined in a consciousness; for without this, nothing can thereby be thought or known, because the given representations have not in common the act of apperception, 'I think,' and would not thereby be joined in a consciousness.

"The *understanding*, to speak generally, is the faculty of *cognitions*. These consist in the determined relationship of given representations to an object. But an *object* is that in the conception whereof the diversity of a given intuition is united. But all union of representations requires unity of consciousness in the synthesis of them. Consequently unity of consciousness is that alone which constitutes the relationship of representations to an object; consequently their objective validity; consequently that they become cognitions, and upon which, therefore, even reposes the possibility of the understanding.

"The first pure cognition of the understanding, therefore, whereon its entire remaining use is founded, which, at the same time, is quite independent of all conditions of sensible intuition, is then the principle of the original *synthetical* unity of the apperception. Thus the simple form of the external sensible intuition, space, is yet not at all cognition. It only furnishes the diversity of the intuition *a priori* for a possible cognition. But in order to know something in space, as for example, a line, I must *draw* it, and consequently effect a determined conjunction of the given diversity synthetically, so that the unity of this action is at the same time the unity of consciousness (in the conception of a line), and thereby first of all an object (a determined space) is known. The synthetical unity of consciousness is therefore an objective condition of all cognitions, not of that which I merely require to know an object, but to which every intuition must be subjected, in order to become an object as to me; because otherwise, and without this synthesis, the diversity would not be united in a consciousness.

"This last proposition is, as it was stated, itself analytical, although in fact it makes synthetical unity into the condition of all thinking; for it states nothing further but that all my representations must stand in some given intuition under the condition under which alone I can refer my representations to the identical self, and consequently can connect them synthetically in one apperception, by means of the general expression, 'I think.'"—*Critick of Pure Reason*, pp. 103-105.

Few persons, on reading this passage, would discern that that which it describes has its parallel mainly in the following simple case. A person fixes his eyes on a column of arithmetical figures. His sense-perception of them, according to Kant, is nothing but a sight of them as forms, having color, and existing in space. That sight of them is an intuition. The series of separate figures, or forms, is the diversity of the intuition. The contemplation of the figures as signs of numbers is equivalent to the act of the understanding in discerning the peculiarity of each element of the diversity in an ordinary intuition of an object, in which extension, figure, color, and other qualities are united. The act of the intellect, in adding the figures of the column together, is the synthetical union of the diversity of the intuition. The sum formed by this addition is the object constituted by the union of that diversity. The apprehension of that sum is the cognition or knowledge of the object; and the conjoining of the diversity of the figures in a consciousness, is the person's consciousness that he actually adds the figures together in the sum which their union forms. It is not enough to secure that consciousness, that he is conscious that he adds the first five figures into a single sum, say forty; and then dropping that, is conscious again that he adds the next five into another sum, say twenty-five; and then dropping that, is conscious again that he adds the remaining figures into a third sum, say fifteen; as in that case he would form three objects of cognition instead of one. But he must add all the figures of the column into a single sum, and be conscious that he makes that union of them, and that the sum which results is the sum which they form as a totality, in order that he may have that unity of consciousness which is requisite to constitute "an object" of cognition.

So the intellect, in ideally constructing an object, as an oak-leaf—that is, forming it in conception—must form it in space, and by uniting together in the relations in which they naturally stand with each other in a real oak-leaf, all the different elements that belong to it as it appears to the senses, such as extension, figure, color; and must be conscious that he unites them all in the self-same object. That which is thus formed, is "the object of cognition."

Many of Dr. Hickok's pages—owing partly to the novelty

of the terms, the unusual sense in which they are used, the remoteness of the processes described from the ordinary sphere of our thoughts, and the misconception of his object into which the reader is thereby betrayed—are equally obscure.

Kant held, at least in effect, that there are but two faculties of intelligence—the Understanding and Reason, and but two corresponding species of perception; and therefore but two species of objects perceived. Dr. Hickok holds that there are three faculties of intelligence, and three corresponding species of perception. He says:

“The Intellect is inclusive of the entire capacity for knowing, and is the source of all cognitions attainable through the functions of whatever faculty. The cognitions differ not numerically merely, but also in kind, as they are the products of the intellect through different faculties. These different faculties are, THE SENSE, THE UNDERSTANDING, and THE REASON. . . . These three faculties include all the powers of human intelligence, and fill our entire capacity for intellectual action; nor may we attain the conceptions of any other form of intellectual agency for any being. So far as human conception can reach we have exhausted the entire subject of psychological investigation in reference to all possible forms of knowledge, when we have attained the functions, and their law of operation respectively, of the Sense, the Understanding, and the Reason.”—Pp. 107, 108.

His object accordingly is, to ascertain the functions and law of these faculties, and thereby determine their several spheres, and his method is, to attain the subjective idea of each faculty, the objective law of its operation, and their correlation to each other.

“To know, in all cases, implies both *the knowing* and *the known*, and thus both a subjective and objective. The subjective part is the knowing; and so far as subjective only, it involves the intellectual agency and the product of this agency, as the completed conception or thought. . . . The objective part is the known; and so far as objective only, it involves the content or matter as essence, and the mode as form. . . . All knowledge thus involves a subjective thought, and a correlative objective form. If now, with Plato, we call the subjective thought *Idea*, and with Bacon call the objective form *Law*, we shall then say, that in all knowledge the subjective idea and the objective

law must stand to each other in correlation. The criterion of all knowledge, and which, when applied, makes the result to be science, is therefore this: the determined [ascertained] accordance of the subjective *Idea* and the objective *Law*."—Pp. 98, 99.

That the object at which he thus mainly aims, is to determine the functions of the several faculties of intelligence, and raise our knowledge of them to the rank of a science, and that it is to that end solely that he proceeds to ascertain the subjective idea and objective law of each faculty, is not stated by him with sufficient clearness. Kant, by assuming that the objects of sense and the understanding exist only in the mind; that they are conditioned by space and time, and that all their phenomena fall within the categories of quantity, quality, relation, and modality; considered himself as determining the exact nature of all their functions, reducing the knowledge we gain through them to a science, and cutting off the ascription to them of any other objects or acts of intelligence. And there the use terminated of the *à priori* method he pursued. It had no still ulterior object. He, however, regarded himself as having demonstrated, by his determination of the functions of the sense and understanding, that there are no materials in them of a knowledge, either of the existence of such an external world as our senses present to us, or of God.

Dr. Hickok conducts his investigation, especially of the sense, seemingly as though the *à priori* conditions of its phenomena were determined—not for the purpose simply of ascertaining the exact nature and limits of its functions, and reducing them to a science—but for the establishment of some ulterior fact, or truth. He represents the *à priori* positions which he establishes as filling the same office in the explanation of the functions of the mind, as gravitation does in explaining the phenomena of the system of material worlds; whereas, instead of being a force or forces like gravitation, to which the phenomena owe their existence, they are the mere characteristics of the phenomena themselves. Let the reader bear it in mind then, that the object of determining by an *à priori* process what the conditions of the phenomena of the perceptive faculties of the mind are, is simply to ascertain the objects and nature of their functions, and there-

by preclude the ascription to them of any other objects or operations than those that belong to their sphere.

He begins accordingly with "the faculty of the sense," and aims first to ascertain the subjective *idea* of a perception by it, and its objective law. The reader, to understand him, should notice the following definitions of his terms.

"In the *Sense*, I include our whole faculty for bringing any object within the distinct light of consciousness, and making it there immediately to appear, and such cognitions, as appearance in consciousness, constitute *knowledge in the sense*. The intellectual agency, which takes up these appearances in consciousness, as distinct objects of knowledge, I term *apprehension*. When the apprehension is that of appearance having position and figure in space, it is of the *external sense*; when the apprehension is that of appearance determinative of the inner state and agency of the mind itself, and thus that the states and acts of the mind become its own objects in consciousness, it is of the *internal sense*. The completed process in the functions of the sense is *perception*, viz. the *taking* of the appearance as object given in consciousness *through some medium*. The appearance as object perceived, is called *phenomenon*. *The states and acts of the mind*, apprehended in the internal sense, as truly as *the objects* apprehended in the external sense, and which have position and shape in space, are phenomena; since they all *appear* in consciousness, and are thus perceived. We as truly perceive a thought or emotion as we do a color or a sound. The phenomenon has its *matter* and its *form*. *The matter* is the content which is given from somewhere in the sensibility; and the *form* is that modification of the matter which permits that it may be classified, or ordered in particular relationships with other phenomena.

"The capacity for receiving the content, as matter for a phenomenon, is *sensibility*. The affection induced by the reception of the content in the sensibility, is *sensation*. In this we include the affection particularly which *precedes* perception, and is conditional for it. The eye or the ear, as organ of sensibility, may be affected by a content from somewhere given, as by the rays of light, or the undulations of the air; and this impression or affection is it precisely which we mean by *sensation*, and which is the condition for the intellectual apprehension and perception. There is also an affection of the inner state which may *succeed* the perception, and for which the perception is conditional. The perceived landscape, or music, &c., may affect the inner state agreeably or otherwise, and such affection, if called a sensation, should be distinguished from the result of an organic affection. We might call the organic sensibility the *sensorium*, and the sensibility of the

inner state, *the sensory*; and the products, or affections, in the first, *sensations*; and those in the last *emotions*.

"The faculty for giving form to the matter in the sensation is *the imagination*. It is the faculty which conjoins and defines—the constructing faculty—and is a peculiar intellectual process.

"An object which is void of all content in sensation, and has only its limits constructed in space or time, is termed *pure*; while such object as has a content in the sense, is termed *empirical*. Thus any mathematical diagram is *pure* object; and any color, or weight, or sound, is *empirical* object. *Intuition* is an *immediate* beholding, and is *pure intuition* when the beholding is in reference to a pure object, and *empirical intuition* when the beholding is in reference to an empirical object.

"A judgment is a determined relationship between two or more cognitions or conceptions. Thus, in a line, I perceive a straightness or a curvature; and I affirm as determined of the cognition of the line, and that of straightness or of curvature, a relation between them as of subject and predicate, in the judgment the line is straight or the line is curved. . . . In the formation of judgments, the intellectual process is in two ways, each giving its own specific kind of judgments, and which from the process is termed *an analytical judgment*, or a *synthetical judgment*. An analytical judgment takes the cognition, or conception, as in the consciousness, and by an analysis of it attains other cognitions or conceptions, which are determined in their relationship to the first, and predicated of it. Thus of the line, I need only an analysis of it, and I shall find as already in it, extension, divisibility, &c., and may affirm the relationship in an analytical judgment—the line is extended, is divisible, &c.

"A synthetical judgment attains, in some way, an entirely new cognition, and adds this in its determined relationship to the given one, and thus truly extends the cognition over more than its original ground. Thus the cognition of color as phenomenon may not only be analysed, and affirmed that it has position, divisibility, &c., but that which no analysis could get out from it, a further experience may get and add to it, viz. that it may be changed in intensity, in position, in figure; may be in motion, may be blended with other colors, may vanish away, &c. Here, beyond what is given in the simple cognition of the phenomenon, and thus beyond what any analysis of the color can give, by various experiments we have new phenomena in a determined relationship to the original color, and we affirm in the synthetical judgment—the color is changed, is moved, is blended. Now, the process in this case explains at once the manner of attaining the new cognition, and determining its relationship to the old, and



the correctness of the judgment depends upon *the validity of the experience*. The original perception of the color, and the subsequent perception of its change, or motion, &c., both rest upon the same basis in experience; and it is as valid to affirm that the color changes or moves from the subsequent experience, as that the color itself is from the original experience. The knowledge is verified in consciousness.

"But here suppose the scepticism to arise, that *the appearance in the consciousness* may be *delusive*; and suppose the argument to be urged, that as the *matter* given to the sensibility is not the *form* which is apprehended in the intellect, therefore by a conclusion on one side, there can be only a mere *intellectual* form; or by a conclusion on the other side, there can only be the *material* content; or from this alleged contradiction between consciousness and the deductions of reason, we can only *doubt* whether either *the matter or the form exists*; we must at once see, that the ground on which we had made our synthetical judgments has fallen away, and our experience itself is to be verified, if we would annihilate this threefold scepticism. We are not yet competent to affirm anything about our phenomena of color, and its changes, motions, and blendings, until we have examined *experience itself*, and become competent to determine its validity in its conditional laws.

"The validity of our experience is, in this, made to rest upon the judgment—that the definite phenomenon intellectually apprehended in the consciousness, *is identical with the material content received in the sensibility*; or, in fewer words, that *the intellect apprehends what the sensibility has received*, and unless the validity of such a judgment can be demonstrated, the scepticism may remain. To leave this to assumption, is to betray the whole science of perception. But such a judgment is wholly synthetical. By no analysis of the apprehension can we attain the sensation, and by no analysis of the sensation can we attain the apprehension. Neither is given in the other, and no analysis of either or both can conclude in such a judgment. As a synthetical judgment also, it is quite beyond all experience to determine the relationship of these two conceptions—that of the apprehended phenomenal form, and that of the received material content; inasmuch as they are conditional for perception, and cannot therefore be given in perception. We are therefore forced to attain some transcendental position, if we would attempt to determine in a judgment, what relation the form in the intellectual apprehension has to the material content in the sensibility. And both in the faculty of the understanding, and of the reason, as well as here in the faculty of the sense, we shall find our whole difficulty to lie in synthetical judgments,

viz. the determination of the relationship of the two conceptions, one of which is predicate of the other in the judgment. The only relief possible is some *a priori* position, from which may be carried forward a transcendental demonstration.

"An *a priori* cognition may be discriminated from all others in this, that it is not a dependent nor a consequent, not a product nor a remnant; but possesses in itself necessity and universality. *It must so be*, and this everywhere and ever more."—Pp. 111–118.

The object which he thus proposes is, first to ascertain by an *a priori* investigation, what the exact functions of the sense are, and determine their limits. This he represents as to involve a demonstration of the validity of our experience, which he explains to be "a verification of the judgment—that the definite phenomenon intellectually apprehended in the consciousness, is identical with the material content received in the sensibility—or that the intellect apprehends what the sensibility has received." And finally, the result of his determination of the functions of the sense he states is to be, that he shall be able to confute the materialist, the idealist, and the sceptic.

The first universal and necessary characteristic of sense-perception which he presents is, that the object perceived exists in space. This he does in the following manner:

"Whatever object we may apprehend in an experience,—a house, tree, mountain—it is for the sense; and as phenomenal, an assemblage of single qualities only. We now take any such object—a house—and proceed to make abstraction of the several phenomena which any organs of sense have given in the perception. Color has appeared, and we now exclude it; smoothness or roughness, hard or soft, weight or resistance, as they have been given we now take away; and so also of sounds, odors, tastes, or any qualities of any possible function of the sense we now remove; and thus make a complete abstraction of all content which the entire sensibility may have received. We shall still have *the void place*, which had been occupied by the qualities now abstracted. This remains for the intellect alone, . . . but for the intellect it remains immovable and indestructible. It remains in defiance of all further attempts to a more complete abstraction in that place. It is the real *form* of that object, from which the *matter* has now been utterly taken away. While this real form is no longer cognition in *experience*, the intellect truly possesses it, and clearly cog-

nises that it was *conditional* for the phenomena as object, and that *without it*, the matter could not have had place and figure, and that the place was *prior* to the matter which appeared in it, and is now when the matter is gone."—Pp. 124, 125.

In thus representing, however, that in abstracting from an object of sense-perception all the qualities that are perceived, the object itself is completely abstracted, and a void space left, he assumes that there is no real perception through the senses of external objects as substances, in which the qualities discerned inhere; and thence that all that the intellect takes cognisance of in a sense-perception, is phenomenon that is within the percipient himself. But in this he takes for granted the very point which he proposes to try, viz. What are the limits within which the functions of the senses are confined? and what is the nature of those functions? Do the senses merely furnish phenomena that are wholly within the percipient himself; or are they the media of a direct and absolute perception of external objects which cause those phenomena? In deciding, without inquiry, that they only furnish phenomena that are within the percipient, and involve no perception of the exterior causes which occasion those phenomena, he places himself on the ground of Kant, and notwithstanding his seeming admissions to the contrary, prepares the way for a mere idealism. If the mind actually perceives external objects through the senses, as real existences without itself, that have extension, figure, solidity, weight, motion, and other qualities, which it discerns through the several senses, then simply to abstract those qualities is not to abstract the external existence itself: the ground of the qualities must also be abstracted, in order to constitute an ideal void space. By abstracting the mere qualities, however, he regards himself as showing that space is necessarily and universally a condition of the phenomena of a sense-perception. "It is wholly," he says, "a transcendental cognition, and yet far more valid, and sure in its own light to the intuition, than any perception of phenomenon in the sense can be. Here, then, upon a valid cognition of pure space in the primitive intuition, we may safely take up one of our transcendental positions."—P. 126.

He next proceeds to obtain by a similar process a cogni-

tion of time, as a necessary condition for the internal phenomena of perception.

"We will take any of these inner phenomena, as they come and depart in the changes of our internal state—say, a train of thought as passing in the mind. As one arises and departs, for the introduction of another, the apprehension of them must be successive, and thus together they form a series. If, then, we abstract the phenomenal, as the states and exercises of the intellect in thinking, and thereby utterly exclude the thoughts in the train, there will remain the succession in the instants in which they passed, and which must be a *void period*, that had been occupied by the passing thoughts now abstracted. This abides for the intellect alone, and resists all efforts that it should be taken away. There is nothing phenomenal remaining in it, and yet it remains incapable of annihilation. It is a *real form* for the content of the thought which once filled it, but which has now been taken quite out of it, and left it indestructible. We have now attained it in the chronological order, after the possession of the phenomenon, but yet it is manifest that it was *conditional* for the phenomenon, and was *prior* to it, for without it there could have been no succession in which the series of the thoughts could have transpired."—Pp. 126, 127.

By this method, he shows that time is also a necessary and universal condition of the phenomena of sense, and thence concludes, that space and time are to be taken as transcendental positions, that are given in *a priori* cognitions, and are necessary to the possibility of "all the real forms in which the intellect can order any appearance in the sense."

He proceeds, thirdly, to show that in every form constructed by the intellect in space and time,—by a process which it is not necessary that we should detail,—there first is unity, or it is formed by the union of what was before disconnected; next, that there is also a plurality, inasmuch as it is formed by the union of parts; and thirdly, that there is a totality, or a whole with determined limits, in contradistinction from a plurality that is not cut off by completion from what is not included in it. And these he presents as three other *a priori* elements, of every conceivable form in space and time, and they answer to Kant's category of quantity.

He proceeds, fourthly, by a process of distinction or dis-

crimination, to determine certain other necessary and universal elements of all sensation; and shows, that in every sensation "there is something opposed to nothing which appears;" that "in this distinction of appearance from non-appearance in the consciousness, is first attained the conception of a phenomenal *reality*; and that this is the first element in the operation of distinction, viz. *Reality*." But as the simple fact that it is a reality leaves it possible that it may be any one of an infinite number, in order to a perfect discrimination of it, it must be determined as a particular individual reality, in distinction from all others. "Particularity is thus a second element of distinction." And finally, to complete the discrimination, it must be shown what it is that distinguishes it from all others. Peculiarity is, therefore, a third element of distinction.

"The operation of distinction is always complete in this, that it finds a reality, particularized from all others, and peculiar in itself, and thus a precise appearance is given in the consciousness. This operation of distinction as an intellectual work, bringing the diverse sensation into a precise appearance in consciousness, may properly be termed *observation*. The completed result, as precise appearance in consciousness, is *quality*. All sensation, as distinguished in a complete observation, becomes quality, and may be of different *kinds*, as colors, weights, sounds; and also of different *varieties*, as red, green, yellow, &c.; and also differ as *inner appearance*, as thought, feeling, volition.

"We have thus attained the elements of all possible distinction on the objective side, and can affirm that universally, and from necessity, all possible distinguishable quality must possess reality, particularity, and peculiarity. The operation of distinction in all possible sensation, must find these *a priori* elements, so many, and no more." Pp. 189-191.

The meaning of these points expressed in plain terms, is, that all that can be affirmed of any object of a mere sense-perception is within the sphere of quantity and quality of *phenomena*; and the design of proving this, is simply—by showing that those two classes of properties or predicates are all that are comprised within the functions of sense, to exclude from the sphere of the senses the perception of external existences. In this, also, he proceeds on the ground of Kant, that the

intellect has no knowledge through the senses of external objects.

Such are the several universal and necessary elements, according to him, of the functions of the senses. They are conditioned by space and time, and all that belongs to them is comprised within the categories of quantity and quality of *phenomena*. The question now is, whether this is a complete view of the functions of sense; and these are the true limits of the knowledge which we gain through it. And this is a far more comprehensive question than he represents it in the following passage:—

“ Perception we now know to be the taking of objects through the medium of sensation; and the process by which they are taken we know to be an intellectual operation, distinguishing the matter in its peculiar quality, and constructing its form in a definite measure, as so much of space, so much of time, or so much in amount. This knowledge of what perception is, enables us to determine *what objects* perception can attain, and thus to make an accurate circumscription of the whole field of knowledge, which can come within the possession of the faculty of the sense. . . . This is all that the faculty of the sense can accomplish in attaining objects, viz. distinguishing and conjoining into the forms of time and amount, the *inner* exercises; and distinguishing and conjoining into the forms of space, time, and amount, the outer qualities; and thereby giving to the consciousness distinct and definite inner and outer *phenomena*. Such *constructed appearances* in consciousness, are all *the objects* which the functions of the intellect in the sense are competent to reach, and which must, therefore, *consist of the phenomenal alone*.

“ It is not important that we here have regard, for our present design, to anything but *the phenomena* themselves, as given in perception, since the sole end now in view is the demonstration of their valid being. These phenomena are inclusive of all the appearance given in consciousness, . . . i.e. the affections of our inner state by our intellectual exercises, and of our organic sensibility by the content from somewhere given within it. These are thoughts, feelings, volitions, &c., as the phenomena of the internal sense; and colors, sounds, odors, &c., as the phenomena of the external sense. The conditions of all perception, carried out according to the necessary and universal law, which must be embodied in the actual process, give *such distinct and definite appearances* in the consciousness, and which we thus term phenomena, and of which, as both inner and outer, we *now come to inquire*,—Have they a valid being?”—Pp. 281-284.

"With this full in mind that *the sense can only attain phenomena* in their completeness as distinguished quality and conjoined quantity, and thus an appearance in consciousness of both matter and form; and this only for the percipient subject alone, in whose perception of phenomena none others can come in communion, but must each have their perceptions exclusively for themselves:—we have the point to which an *ontological demonstration* must be conducted directly before us, viz. Is the phenomenon as appearance in my consciousness a valid reality, or only a seeming to be? May I demonstrate that the matter and form have each an actual, and not merely an imaginary being?"—P. 286.

According to this, therefore, the question whether the view of the sense he has given, through his *à priori* investigation, is a complete view of its functions, is nothing more than the question whether there are actually such phenomena, or appearances of the sense *in consciousness*, as the intellect apprehends and treats as real in its distinctions and judgments. But that is nothing more than the question whether the intellect is in reality the subject of such apprehensions, thoughts, and feelings, as those which take place in its consciousness of the phenomena of sense. That, however, is not the point at all on which the question turns, whether the view he gives of the functions of the sense embraces all that is comprised in them. That the phenomena of the sense which he enumerates are real phenomena *to the intellect*, no one doubts. It is not their reality *to the intellect* which the idealist or the sceptic denies, but whether they are the effects of the action on the senses of an outer world which answers to them; and whether the intellect has, in them, a real perception and knowledge of that outer world. This is apparent from his statement in the following passage:—

"Though we do not at all attempt here to determine *whence* the content in sensation *comes*, nor what at all is its *causality*, inasmuch as whatever is given in the phenomenal, in the clear light of consciousness, must be from *the sensational content itself*, and not at all revealing that causality; yet do we abundantly demonstrate an objectiveness which cannot admit that it should be known as only and wholly mental. And this is both all that is possible from the data given in the Rational Psychology of perception, and all that is needed

for meeting the scepticism which, in any form of idealism, may attack the reality of the phenomenal, as given in the sense. The determination of the *causality* for sensation must await a further psychological investigation in the domain of the understanding, whence we may gain data for this further ontological demonstration.

"The sense, it is thus clear, may reach no further in its knowledge, than to that which is put within *its own field*; and *this field must ever be circumscribed within the self-consciousness.*"—Pp. 307, 308.

But to maintain thus, that all that the intellect perceives in the sphere of the sense, exists in itself and in the sense, to the exclusion of everything without, is to maintain that it has no perception of external objects through the sense. But if it has no perception of them through that medium, it is quite clear that it has no perception of them whatever through any media, and consequently the whole function of sense and of the intellect, in regard to its phenomena, is resolved into mere idealism. This is the view, accordingly, maintained by Kant, from whom Dr. Hickok drew the whole of his *à priori* determination of the functions of sense; and is that also maintained by the idealists of the present day who follow in his train. They hold that neither the sense nor the understanding, which they indeed treat much as though it included the sense, furnishes any media of a knowledge either of an outer world such as appears in the senses, or of any supersensuous existence; and thence that if God is discerned and known, it must be by an immediate intuition, or beholding without means. In limiting the perception of the intellect, therefore, to the *phenomena* of the senses, in distinction from the exterior objects by which those phenomena are caused, he has omitted the most important function of the sense, which is to make the external existences which produce those phenomena, the objects of direct perception to the intellect, as real and absolute, as its perception is of the phenomena of its own consciousness.

1. That there is such a direct perception of external existences by the intellect through the phenomena of the senses, is clear from consciousness. We are conscious, for example, that in sight, the objects which we see, are those external



objects from which the light is radiated or reflected into the eye, and which appear to be seen by us. That consciousness is as immediate and distinct, as our consciousness is that the acts of perception, emotion, and volition, that take place within us, are our acts, emotions, and volitions; or that the pain which we feel in an organ of the body, is a pain within ourselves. The consciousness of sight is not a consciousness of the image formed on the retina, of the object seen, which is the condition of the sight of that object; for we have no consciousness of the image whatever. It is not an object of thought. The intellect has no cognisance of it. To those who have learned that it is painted there, the recollection of it does not occur in one out of many millions of acts of sight; and not one in a hundred thousand ever heard or suspected its existence. It is the object itself then from which the image is radiated which the mind is conscious it sees.

There is no other view on which the phenomena of sight, and our consciousness respecting it, are explicable. The idealist seems to suppose, that if we really beheld such external objects as we seem to see in sight, our consciousness of seeing them would be quite different from that which we now have. That, however, is wholly gratuitous and absurd. No one can describe or conceive a more specific, determinate, and absolute consciousness of the real sight of external objects, than that which we have when we behold them. Let any one make the trial, and he will find himself baffled. The feeling is as immediate and positive, as the feeling is of the subjectiveness of the pain that takes place in an organ when it is injured by an exterior object. When one receives a painful stroke on his limb, and looks at it, to ascertain its state, is he not as certain that he sees it, as he is that he feels the pain in it? Is he not as conscious that the sight which he is experiencing, is the sight of his limb, as he is that the pain he is feeling, is the pain of his limb? And is not his knowledge of the object of sight as a perceived existence, of precisely the same kind as his knowledge is of any of the phenomena of his intellect, such as memory or imagination? Has he not precisely the same knowledge in kind that he sees a landscape, which he beholds with the eye, as he has that he conceives of a landscape, which he forms in his imagination? No one can fail to see that such is the fact.

The objects and acts differ; but the consciousness that the act of sight is the sight of the external object to which the eye is directed, is as clear and indubitable as the consciousness is that the act of conception is the conception of an imaginary landscape.

If the external object, which is the apparent cause of the perception, were not the object perceived, the perception would undoubtedly be wholly different from what it is. That which the mind is conscious of perceiving, is unquestionably that which it *really* perceives. But in sight, it certainly is not conscious of the image on the retina, nor of the impulse of the light that by reflection from the retina forms that image. They are not objects of thought in any relation, and most are unaware that any such effects take place in the eye. As then indubitably it is not the image, nor the separate rays of light that form it, which the intellect is conscious of perceiving, it must be the object from which those rays are radiated or reflected. There is no other that can be the object of its perception. So also in touch; that which the mind is conscious of perceiving, is not the compression of the organ of touch, as the ends of the fingers. It knows nothing of the exact change that is produced by the resistance of the body felt, in the relative position of the particles of the skin, the flesh, the blood-vessels, and the nerves. It is totally ignorant what those particles are in nature, number, and relation, anterior to the pressure; and totally ignorant what the alteration in their absolute or relative position is, that is the condition and medium of the sensation occasioned by the resistance of the body felt. All which it is conscious of perceiving is, the resistance itself, and that it is produced by a body exterior to the organ on which the resistance is exerted. As then it is not the change in the position of the particles of which the organ of touch consists, which it is conscious it perceives, the external object itself which produces that change, must be the object of its perception. There is nothing else that can enter into its apprehension. So also in hearing; the intellect has no perception of the vibration of the drum of the ear. It has no knowledge whatever of the change that takes place in the position of the particles of that organ. Thousands are not aware that they have such an organ. What it perceives is simply, first, the

sensation of sound which results from that vibration, and next, that that sound is produced by a cause external to the body. As then it is not the change that takes place in the organ of hearing, which it perceives to be the cause of the sound heard, it must be the external agent which produces that change in the organ which is the means of the sound. There is no explanation of the fact that in hearing, touch, taste, and smell, the mind is conscious that the causes that produce those sensations are exterior to itself and the organs in which the sensations take place, but the fact that these causes are exterior to itself and those organs; nor any explanation of the fact that in sight the intellect is conscious that it perceives the objects of its sight, and as exterior to itself and the eye, but the fact that they are exterior and are actually beheld by it as such.

In like manner, on the supposition that the mind's perception is confined to that which exists in itself, and takes place in its organs of sense, there is no explanation of the changes that are produced in its perceptions by the application of instruments to the eye. If its perception is confined to that which exists within itself and the organs of sight, then no reason can be given or conceived for the change that is wrought in its perceptions by the interposition of a lens, as of a microscope or telescope, between the eye and the object seemingly perceived. Those and all similar instruments are indisputably exterior to the perceiving intellect, and to the eye. If, then, they are not the instruments of a real perception of external objects that radiate or reflect light through them, the only effect which they produce must be in the eye itself, and the nerve that connects it with the brain. But the intellect takes no cognisance whatever of the change that is produced in the particles of the retina, the nerve that passes from it to the brain, or the brain itself, by the telescope, the microscope, or the lenses that are ordinarily used in reading. It has no knowledge whatever of the nature of these organs; the number, relations, or motions, of the particles of which they consist do not enter in any degree into its perception. They lie as completely out of the sweep of its cognition, as they would had they no instrumentality in its perceptions. As then the effect on the organs of those exterior instruments, which often bring wholly new objects

into the sphere of vision, is not at all the object of the mind's consciousness or notice, there is no conceivable explanation of the change that takes place in its perceptions, but that the objects which it perceives are actually exterior to itself, and are really perceived by it.

If the objects of our sense-perceptions are not really external to us, and essentially what we take them to be, then our actions towards them are infinitely inexplicable and absurd. If those objects really exist without us, and are what we regard them, then to act towards them as we do, is natural and unavoidable. Yet what can be the office of our acts, if no such objects exist; if, for example, there is to each individual no human being but himself; if there are no such beings as parent and offspring; no such events as birth, nurture, growth, and education; no such things as nourishing the body by food, protecting and adorning it by dress, and warming it by fire; no such things as health and sickness, pleasure and pain, life and death? If to each individual all other human beings, and their relations, are mere ideas, how happens it that they are considered as having a permanent existence, and subsisting as truly and in their peculiar relations, when they are not objects of thought, as when they are? What can be meant by nourishing those ideas by food; decorating them by dress; warming them by fire; and resting them by sleep? What can be meant by their suffering sickness, and being cured by medical prescriptions? What can be meant by their assuming the functions of living conscious agents, and doing and enjoying good, and perpetrating and suffering evil? Can a greater solecism be conceived than the conversion of such a perception or notion of the mind, into a conscious mind itself, possessed of all the faculties and sensibilities of an intelligent nature like our own? What can be meant by the life of such ideas in society as moral agents, their subjection to law, and their being judged and rewarded according to their voluntary conduct? And finally, what can be meant by their dying, their being buried, and being raised at length to another life? Can greater contradictions be conceived, than that such an exterior conscious, active, and responsible being should be predicated of ideas—which instead of independent existences are mere states or affections of the mind? No

grosser insult can be offered to the intellect or heart, than to represent all these great realities which involve the whole truth and worth of our existence, as mere ideas; a deceptive and empty pageant imposed on us by our nature. If they are not real, and what our constitution forces us to take them to be, we are the victims of a more degrading and cruel illusion than any other of which an intelligence can be conceived to be the subject. Joy and sorrow, good and evil, life and death, are converted alike into a pitiless mockery.

No human being, accordingly, can for a moment act on the assumption that these external objects and events are not real, and what our nature leads us to regard them. No parent ever attempted to treat his children as though they were mere ideas. No violation of nature can be conceived so shocking and impossible, as a compulsion to treat them as such mere unrealities would be. No philosopher, however confident in his speculative idealism, ever undertook to verify it by attempting to live without food, without rest, or without breathing. The clamors of his nature for the accustomed means of continued subsistence, would instantly hush his speculation into silence, and force him to act on the fact that his body is a real outward existence, and is sustained in health and life from instant to instant by the use of means that are external to itself.

The supposition that we do not truly perceive the external objects of our sense-perceptions, and that they have not a real existence without us, is equally incompatible also with the morality of our actions. If there are no living corporeal human beings external to us, it is plain there can be no obligation to act towards such beings as though they were real existences. If there are no such beings, most certainly no such beings can have rights, and thence no acts whatever can involve a violation of their rights. There consequently can be no breach of their rights by theft, robbery, violence, or dishonesty. How can there be a robbery, if no property exists? How can there be violence to fellow-beings, if no such beings exist to be the objects of violence? How can there be manslaughter, or murder, if there is no one who has life, of which he can be deprived by those acts? The whole sphere of morality; of just and unjust actions; of benignant and malevolent dispositions, is annihilated by the non-exist-

ence of any fellow-creature towards whom they may be exerted: and hence, rules, laws, penalties, and rewards, for acts towards fellow-beings, are turned into a senseless farce.

It annihilates, in like manner, the possibility of natural and revealed religion. If there is no external existence, then there are no media for a knowledge of God, and no revelation of him can have ever taken place. If there is no external world that is known to us, then there is no human race; and consequently there has not been a fall, a work of redemption, a religion of sacrifices typical of the sacrifice of a Mediator; nor a Mediator himself. If there is not a real and veritable perception of external personal agents and objects, then Christ has not been seen, his teachings consequently have never been heard, his miracles beheld, his death witnessed, nor his resurrection verified. Neither has his gospel been preached, nor his renewing Spirit been poured out on men; and the whole fabric of Christianity, foundation and top-stone, is swept from existence.

We have thus every proof that is conceivable, and in the highest measure that is conceivable, that we have through our senses a direct and absolute perception of the external objects which they respect, and that our perception of them is a real, valid knowledge that they exist, and are to us truly what they are: first, a perfect consciousness that we perceive them; next, an absolute certainty that the objects of our perception are not something in the mere organs of sense themselves which we mistake for them; thirdly, the impossibility of accounting for our perceptions, on the supposition that their objects are merely ideal; and the infinite contradiction of that supposition to the effects of the instruments of vision which we use, to our actions in domestic and social life, to the morality of our conduct, and to the possibility of religion. Let philosophers endeavor to conceive of any other species of proof of the veracity of our sense-perceptions of external objects, or in any higher degree, and they will find it impossible. With this stands or falls, not only the possibility of religion and morality, the truth of our knowledge, and the reliableness of our faculties, but our existence itself as social beings.

In omitting this most fundamental element of our sense-perceptions, on which all the others are consequent and

dependent for their importance, Dr. Hickok has thus omitted the most essential function of the senses, and introduced an error into his system, which spreads a fatal influence through its whole domain. If the material and moral universe is not brought to our direct and positive knowledge here, there is no point at a later stage of psychology at which it can be admitted; there is no other channel through which we can have access to it. By this feature, accordingly, his system becomes identical in its main element with that of Kant, who also admitted, as Dr. H. does, that there is some outer cause of sensation; but in denying that we have any perception or cognisance of it in our sense-perceptions, and affirming that they are confined to the effects produced in the senses themselves by that unknown cause, denied that we have any knowledge of the existence of an outer world, reduced our knowledge to the sphere of mere idealism, and subverted thereby the whole fabric of religion, morality, and science. If the intellect, as he affirms, takes cognisance of nothing in its sense-perceptions but that which is within us, how can it be held that it has any knowledge of an exterior cause that produces those sensations?

He accordingly fails in his attempt to confute idealism, in the ontological demonstration with which he closes his investigation of the functions of the sense; inasmuch as the mental phenomena which he represents as objective, are in fact, on his system, wholly subjective, and the product of the intellect itself, not of an external force acting on the senses. The difference which he designates is only such, on his theory, as subsists between different kinds of ideal forms. Thus he says:

"We have seen that it is competent for the intellect to construct all possible pure forms in the primitive intuition of space and time, and thus produce for itself all possible ideal figures and periods. . . . We may then take such completed pure product—say a circle in space—and most certainly it will stand out in the imagination as a definite figure, and limit and *condition all thinking relative to it*, as much as any mere intellectual product can do. It were impossible to think of any other figure than a circle. . . . all that the intellect can do to it, to make it limit and condition its own further development, it has already done, and has thus exhausted all its power to objectify this pure circle. . . . But while as ideal form it is thus objective as far as the intellectual agency can make it, is there no difference in the com-

sciousness between this ideal form and the phenomena of a material ring with its given content in sensation? Is the ideal here, in the same way a limiting of the spontaneous thought, and a conditioning of its development, and an objectifying of itself to its action, as is the real? Is there nothing in the material, as outer objective phenomenon, which is not also in the ideal? The intellect has given all it may to the pure form to make it objective, and yet most manifestly, the phenomenal ring has something more in its objectiveness than the pure circle, and this something more must have been given to it from some other than a mere intellectual operation."—Pp. 300, 301.

This is a satisfactory confutation of idealism to one who holds, that there is an exterior world which is actually the object of perception through the senses, and that the reason that a sense-perception of a circle differs from a mere idea of one, is that the first is seen by the eye, while the other is merely conceived by the intellect; but it is no confutation at all of idealism to one who denies that there is any perception of external material things through the senses; and maintains that all of which the intellect takes cognisance, exists within itself and the sense: for Kant, and others who hold this view, admit, nevertheless, that there is precisely such a difference, as Dr. Hickok specifies, between a circle as it exists in a sense-perception, though according to their theory the understanding is the cause of it, and a circle that is purely ideal. Dr. H., in this argument, therefore, both forgets his own system, and the system of the idealist: for he virtually assumes, on the one hand, that there is a real perception of external objects through the senses; otherwise he could not exhibit the objectiveness of the phenomena of sense-perceptions as anything more than the work of the intellect, and therefore wholly ideal. And, on the other hand, he, in effect, assumes that the idealist denies that there is any difference between objects as they are seen in the senses, and as they are conceived by the intellect independently of sense; as otherwise he would not regard his demonstration that there is a difference between such objects, as a confutation of idealism.

He thus, instead of presenting a true view of the functions of the senses, assumes at the outset of his investigation that they take no cognisance whatever of the external world, the percep-



tion and knowledge of which is their main and most important office; and proceeds throughout his inquiry into their powers and operations on the ground of Kant, which necessarily results in a sheer and unmitigated idealism. This error pervades also his theory of the understanding; the consideration of which, however, we must postpone to our next number.

---

ART. II.—NOTES ON SCRIPTURE. CRITICAL CONJECTURES.

1 *Thess.* ii. 16. For the wrath is come upon them *to the uttermost* rather (*εις τελος*) *to the end*, that is (*αιωνος*) of the age or present dispensation, or, as Luke expresses it (*xxi.* 24), till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. Thus explained, this text connects itself with such passages as *Rom.* xi. 25; *Matt.* xxiii. 38, 39.

*John* xvi. 8, 9. "And when he (the Comforter) is come, he will reprove (*τον κοσμον*) the world of sin . . . . because they believe not on me;" *ου πιστεύουσιν εις εμε*.

Who are intended by the word *they*;—the world, meaning mankind generally, or the Jews? The translators of the authorized version appear to have adopted the former sense, although they must have known that this Evangelist never uses the word *κοσμος* as the nominative of a verb in the plural. (See *chaps.* i. 10; iii. 17; vii. 7; xii. 19; xiv. 17, 19, 27, 31; xv. 18, 19; xvi. 20; xvii. 14, 21, 23, 25.) In the second and third verses of this chapter we find similar phrases: "*They* shall put you out of synagogues," &c. "*These* things shall *they* do," &c., "because *they* have not known the Father nor me." The Jews are plainly meant here, and why not in the ninth verse? Let us assume this sense, and the meaning of the Saviour may be thus expressed: "Because they have not known me, nor the time of their visitation, but have rejected me and my kingdom, therefore the kingdom shall be taken from them—a new dispensation shall be opened, in which all nations shall be included, out of whom I will collect a people, by the agency of the Comforter, whom

I will send." Thus understood, the passage connects itself with Matt. xxi. 1-10 and 43, and Rom. xi. 11.

The other construction is liable to many objections. How could the world believe in him of whom they had not heard, and how could the world hear of him without a preacher, and how should they preach except they be sent (Rom. x. 14, 15)? Yet our Lord expressly forbade his apostles, under their first commission, to preach to Gentiles. (Matt. x. 5, 6.) Not so under the second (Matt. xxviii. 19), which was given in execution of the purpose expressed in (John xvi. 7-12) the words under consideration.

Acts iii. 19, 20. This passage is inaccurately translated. Read it thus: "Repent ye therefore in order to the blotting out of your sins (*ἵνα ἂν ἰθυσί*), that times of refreshing *may come* from the presence of the Lord, and that (*καὶ ἀποστείλῃ*) *he may send* Jesus Christ," &c. The apostle is to be understood as addressing the exhortation to the Jewish nation, as he makes the second mission of the Messiah hinge, so to speak, upon their national repentance. As if he had said: "Your Messiah, so long expected, has come and gone. You knew him not, and through ignorance and the hardness of your hearts rejected him and put him to death. Think not, however, that you have for ever lost the blessings of God's covenants with your fathers—with Abraham and David. It is not too late. Repent and be converted now, for the blotting out of your sins, and of this last and most aggravated of your sins, and then times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord, and he will send to you again this rejected Jesus, whom, nevertheless, the heavens will detain until the times of the restitution of all things contained in God's covenants and promises as made known to us by the mouth of all his prophets from the beginning of the world." Thus understood, the passage contains much important doctrine. (See Gen. xlix. 10; Matt. xxiii. 37, 39; Rom. xi. 15; Jerem. xxxi. 31-40 and xxxiii. 24, 26.) Glorious things are spoken of Jerusalem. It is still the city of the Great King (Matt. v. 35; Ps. lvi. 2; Luke i. 32). It shall yet be redeemed with judgment (Is. i. 27; lii. 9; lxii. 11, 12), and become the throne of the Lord (Jer. iii. 17). God will yet create Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy (Is. lxv. 18, 19), though now defiled and desolate (Luke xxi. 24; Matt.

xxiii. 38), and this will be when all the things spoken of by the holy prophets (Acts iii. 21) shall be restored in the new heavens and the new earth (Is. lxx. 17) which God will create, wherein righteousness shall dwell (2 Peter iii. 13).

*Eph.* iii. 15. "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom ( $\epsilon\grave{\kappa}\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \o\upsilon\rho\alpha\iota\acute{\nu}\omega\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ ) the whole family in heaven and earth is named," &c. This version does not convey fully the sense of the original. The apostle evidently intimates that there are other worlds and other races or orders of beings, besides man, at the head of whom is the Lord Jesus Christ. His meaning would be better expressed thus: "Of whom every paternity (or fatherhood or race of beings) in the heavens (in all worlds, which God has created, Gen. i. 1) as well as that on earth is named." The word *πατρία* may signify a race deriving its existence from a common ancestor (Luke ii. 4), or inversely the head and the race descended therefrom inclusively. In this sense, all mankind descending from Adam form one of these paternities, and the intimation of the apostle is, that there are myriads of other worlds, containing races or orders of beings sustaining analogous relations to each other and to a common head. The Latin *Vulgate* (with which *Montanus* agrees) renders the verse, "Ex quo omnis paternitas in cœlis et in terra nominatur." *Wicliffe* (who translated from the Latin *Vulgate*) renders it, "Of whom each fadirheed in heavens and erthe is named." *Cassellio* thus: "Ex quo omnis et in cœlis et in terra denominatur cognatio." *Sebast Schmidt* thus: "Ex quo omnis paternitas in cœlis et supra terra nominatur." *Della Lega and Ravizza* thus: "Da cui si nomina ogni parentado ne' cieli e nella terra." *Cranmer and Tyndale* thus: "Which is father over all that is called father in heaven and earth." See also *Erasmus* and *Tremellius*, and the *Rheims* translation.

But to whom does the relative ( $\epsilon\grave{\kappa}\ \o\upsilon$ ) of *whom* refer?—to the immediate antecedent, the Lord Jesus Christ, or to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? In *Eph.* i. 10, the apostle speaks of the Father's purpose ( $\alpha\upsilon\alpha\iota\phi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\omega\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ ) to gather and bind up together, as under one head (viz. Christ), all things ( $\tau\alpha\ \tau\epsilon\ \iota\ \tau\alpha\ \iota\varsigma\ \o\upsilon\rho\alpha\iota\acute{\nu}\omega\varsigma$ ), as well those in the heavens (all other worlds) as on earth; with which we may compare *Phil.* ii. 9, 10, where the same apostle says, that God the

Father has exalted the name Jesus, above every other name, that at this name every knee should bow (*προσκύνησις*) of dwellers in the heavenly worlds, &c. These passages tend to support the former construction. But as God, the Father, is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, this interpretation refers us back ultimately to God as the Father of all beings in all worlds. In this view, how ineffably glorious is the Headship of our Lord Jesus Christ, and how glorious, how godlike, is the vocation of those who shall be employed by him, as kings and priests in his vast dominions! What are all the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them (Matt. iv. 8, 9) when compared with the reward of him who overcometh? Rev. iii. 21. It opens also one meaning of our Lord's reply to Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world," which is but an insignificant province in revolt; I have come now not to reign but to provide the means of restoring it to its lost place in the kingdom of the Heavens.

*John* xix. 25, 27. A deeper meaning appears to be involved in the transaction recorded in these verses than most readers derive from them. "Woman, behold thy son"—Disciple, "Behold thy mother." It was an act of sovereign favor that God chose Abraham, David, Joseph, and Mary to stand in a peculiar relation to the human nature of Messiah, and as such, David and Mary appear to have regarded it. (1 Chron. xvii. 17; 2 Sam. vii. 18; Luke i. 46-48.) By another act of sovereignty, and with miraculous power, the Lord Jehovah filiated the human person he was about to assume, to Joseph and Mary (and as fully and truly to Joseph as to Mary), and became subject to them in the assumed relation of son. (Luke ii. 51.) But having now accomplished the object of his incarnation, so far as it fell within the period of his humiliation, and being about to make his exodus (Luke ix. 31, *Greek*) from the cross to the throne of the Father, his relation to the mother of his human person (as well as to all his redeemed) was henceforth to be a glorious Headship. (Eph. i. 10.) Accordingly, by another act of sovereignty—the opposite of that just mentioned—he sunders the relation he had temporarily assumed for that special purpose (Philip. ii. 7, 8), and by virtue of his Divine authority substitutes John in the place of his human person, which was soon to be glorified and exalted to the head of

creation. As if he had said, "Woman, by an act of sovereignty, I chose thee before I created thee, to bear the relation of mother to this human body taken from thee, and now hanging on this cross as a sacrifice for the sins of men, and also for thy sins. The purpose of this earthly relation between us is now accomplished, and the time has come when the Divine purposes require that I should return to the Father and resume the glory I laid aside when I took from thee this human form. Henceforth regard me not as thy son, but as thy Creator and thy Lord. Yet I leave thee not childless—Behold thy son, whom my grace has emboldened to stand at thy side for this purpose. The relations of all creatures have sprung from my will and my power. I have power to make him thy son in the highest, truest sense. He is thy son." The bearing of this interpretation of the passage on Mariolatry is obvious. (See Matt. xii. 48, 50.) It may suggest also the reason why John so often calls himself "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

*Matt.* iii. 17. "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

These words attested to John the Baptist the Divine Sonship of the Lord Jesus, and the Father's approbation. If we now turn to *Matt.* xvii. 5 (*Mark* ix. 7; *Lu.* ix. 35) we find that the same words were uttered in the hearing of Peter, James, and John, with the addition of a command—"Hear ye him." Why this difference? May we not find it in the different offices to be performed by these persons? John the Baptist was the *forerunner* of the Lord. His ministry must *end* before that of the Lord Jesus could *begin*. (*Matt.* iv. 12, 17.) The disciples, on the other hand, were to be *ambassadors* (ministers, servants) to publish the messages the Lord gave them. Hence the (*ἀκούετε*) command was added—"Hear, obey him," thus making their mission (if we may so say) twice divine—from the Father as well as from the Son. This explanation, if correct, discloses one of those nice congruities or fitnesses, which tend strongly to establish the genuineness of the gospels. No fabricator of fictitious writings would have thought of such a distinction. This is proved by the fact that so few readers of the gospels observe it until pointed out, or if they do, do not discover the reason of it.

**Matt. vi. 9.** "Our Father which art in Heaven"—πατήρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς—In the original Greek, as well as in the Latin Vulgate, we find the plural *heavens*, which our critics, with general if not one consent, consider a Hebraism. It is suggested, however, that the plural is here used with the design to convey an allusion to the omnipresence of the Father. By heavens we are to understand the whole creation (Gen. i. 1)—the universal system of suns and planets established in their orders in illimitable space, and we address the Father as filling them all by his presence, and of course as present with us. These form the Father's (οικία, John xiv. 2) house or dwelling-place. (See Camera-rius and Theophylact on John xiv. 2.) The same allusion is conveyed in Heb. iii. 4, "Every house is builded by some one, but he that built all things"—all worlds as a house or dwelling-place for himself—"is God." The same designation or description of the Father occurs frequently in the gospel of Matthew (see v. 16, 45, 48; vi. 1, 9; vii. 11, 21; x. 32, 33; xii. 50; xviii. 10), and always with evident allusion to the same Divine attribute. The word is also used by him in the singular (see vi. 10, 20) when no such reference is intended, or where the limited nature of the subject forbids the plural sense. To call such expressions *Hebraisms* does not signify much. The Jew might with equal propriety call our form (in the singular) a *Gentilism*. The question is, which form of expression is best adapted to the nature of the subject, and most accurately sets forth the idea intended to be signified. If it should be said that the ancient Hebrews had no adequate or correct idea of astronomy, it may be conceded. But the words of Scripture were all dictated by the Holy Spirit, and the words under consideration were uttered by Him who made all things, and certainly has no need of the teachings of human wisdom or science.

**Matt. iii. 15.** "Suffer it to be so now"—rather (αφ' ὧς αὐτοῖς), "suffer it at this time"—the word αὐτοῖς being used in the sense of the *Heb. hap-pa-am* הַפּא־אִם (Gen. ii. 23; xxix. 35; Exod. ix. 27). There is a tacit allusion in this expression to *another time* or *coming*, as if the Lord had said, "I have now come to offer this human body which I have assumed, as a sacrifice for sin; and the baptism of it, which I seek at your hands, is a typical showing forth of the sacrifice I am to make. But I

shall come (*ex deinceps*, Heb. ix. 28, *ex' ager*, Matt. xxvi. 64) at another time, and at that, my second coming—that time—this rite, as you suppose, will not be proper; for then shall I come without a sin-offering—not in a body to be sacrificed for sin—but in glory for the salvation of those who shall then look for me and love my appearing (Heb. ix. 28; 2 Tim. iv. 8).

May we not suppose that our Lord then first made known, to John the mystery of his sufferings and death; for John at first recoiled from the service required of him, as though it were no part of his office to perform it. It was after this, too, that John called the Lord Jesus, the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world. (John i. 29.) It was then also John discovered the Messiah (whose coming he had announced) in the person of Jesus (John i. 31, 33); first by the special revelation of Jesus, and immediately afterwards by the descent of the Holy Spirit, in the form of a dove. John must have discerned also, in this typical action, the unsuccessful issue of his own ministry; for it was impossible that he should be received by the nation in the spirit of his mission, and Jesus be rejected.

This interpretation of the passage suggests a reason for the (*peculiar*) peculiar phraseology of our Lord's address to John—"For so," that is in this typical way, "it becometh *us* to fulfil all righteousness." The actual fulfilling of all righteousness was certainly our Lord's sole work—"He trod the wine-press alone"—But John could take part with him in this typical action, which significantly set it forth.

PHILO.

### ART. III.—THE LAWS OF SYMBOLIZATION, AND THEIR RESULTS IN INTERPRETATION.

BY THE EDITOR.

IN the article on this subject in the last number of the Journal, we pointed out the way in which the laws of symbols correct the errors of commentators in those of their construc-

tions, in which they disregard the great rule of analogy, that agents represent agents; and showed that they proceed in them on the assumption that the ground of symbolization is resemblance in a single particular, rather than a general correspondence of nature, station, agency, and effects. We shall now adduce another set of examples, in which, although they construe agents as standing for agents, they nevertheless disregard the law of a general resemblance, or exact likeness of nature, agency, and effects; and assume that some single point of likeness, real or imaginary, is the sole basis on which the symbol is used. We present as an instance of this, the construction by Mr. Cuninghame, Mr. Faber, and Mr. Elliott, of the slaughter and resurrection of the witnesses, Rev. xi. 1-14.

"And a reed like a rod was given to me, saying: Rise and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and those who worship in it. And the court which is without the temple reject, and measure it not, for it is given to the Gentiles; and the holy city they shall tread forty-two months. And I will give to my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and sixty days, clothed in sackcloth. They are the two olive trees, and the two lampstands which stand before the Lord of the earth. And if any one wills to injure them, fire proceeds from their mouth, and devours their enemies. And if any one wills to injure them, so he must be killed. They have power to shut heaven that rain may not fall during the days of their prophecy; and have power over waters to turn them to blood, and to smite the ground with every stroke as often as they will.

"And when they would finish their testimony, the wild beast which ascends out of the abyss will make war on them, and will vanquish them, and will kill them: and will place their dead body in the street of the great city which is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, where also their Lord was crucified. And they of the peoples and tribes, and tongues and nations, look on their dead body three days and a half; and they will not suffer their dead bodies to be placed in a sepulchre. And they who dwell on the earth rejoice over them, and exult, and will send gifts to one another; for these two prophets tried them [put them to the test—showed their character] who dwell on the earth.



"And after three days and a half, the spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood on their feet. And great fear fell on those who beheld them. And they heard a great voice from heaven saying to them, *Ascend here.* And they ascended into heaven in the cloud; and their enemies beheld them.

"And in the same hour there was a great earthquake, and the tenth part of the city fell; and names of men [men of name] seven thousand were killed by the earthquake; and the rest became fearful, and gave glory to the God of heaven.

"The second woe is passed; behold, the third woe comes quickly."

The writers to whom we have referred, and commentators generally, in their constructions, grant *virtually*—for the question appears not to have been formally considered by them—that the agents in this vision, viz. the worshippers, the Gentiles, the witnesses, the men who injure them, the wild beast, the individuals who gaze on the dead bodies, the peoples, and tribes, and tongues, and nations, they that dwell on the earth, the enemies who are present at the resurrection and ascension of the witnesses, the seven thousand men of name, and the rest who survived them,—symbolize *agents*, and their acts and conditions represent *acts* and *conditions*. And it is clear that they are used on the principle of exact likeness, instead of analogy, and represent *human beings of their own order*. This is indisputable in regard to the Gentiles, every one who would injure the witnesses, the individuals who look on the dead bodies and do not permit them to be buried, the peoples and tribes, and tongues and nations, they who dwell on the earth, the enemies who are present at the ascent of the witnesses into the heavens in the cloud, the seven thousand men of name, and the rest who became fearful and gave glory to God;—because there are no agents but human beings of those classes whom they can represent. They cannot symbolize angels, good or evil. They cannot stand for the spirits of the dead. Nor can they denote animals; as they do not present to either of them the requisite analogy. They must therefore stand for human beings, and of their own respective orders. And this is in effect assumed in the constructions given by Mr. Cuninghame, Mr. Faber, and Mr. Elliott.

But it is thence certain, also, that the acts and conditions of these several agents, and those of the wild beast likewise—which is also a symbol of men in the sphere of rulers,—are symbols in like manner of the acts and conditions of *men of the classes which they severally represent*. As the actors whom they denote are men, the acts which their representative actions symbolize, must of necessity be the acts of those men respectively whom they represent. As, then, so large a share of these representative agents—the worshippers, the Gentiles who tread the holy city, every man who plots against the witnesses, the individuals who look on the dead bodies, the peoples and tribes, and tongues and nations, the dwellers on the earth, the enemies who are present at the resurrection, the seven thousand men, and the rest who give glory to God—are symbols of *men of their respective classes*, and their acts and conditions, symbols of the like acts and conditions of the men whom they represent; it is to be presumed that the witnesses also are used in the relation of exact likeness, and symbolize *men of their own order in their death, their remaining unburied, and their resurrection and ascent to heaven*. And this is made certain—

First: By the fact, that they do indubitably represent men of their own order and exercising their own office, in their act of prophesying. For who else can they symbolize in that act? There is no analogous order whom they can represent. But not only are the agents whom they symbolize in that office, men of their own peculiar order, who utter the testimony of Jesus; but the act of those symbolized men which their act represents, is the act of prophesying, like that which they themselves exert. What other act of the represented prophets can it be supposed to denote? There is no differing and analogous act which prophets exert. The act symbolized, therefore, is of precisely the same nature, and is to be performed in the same circumstances as the act which is used as its representative. But this makes it certain that the witnesses also, in dying, in their state as dead and unburied, and in their resurrection and ascension, symbolize men in those identical states, or as subjects of those events and conditions; for they are unquestionably used in the same relation throughout the vision. No instance can be found in the Scriptures, in which a symbol is used in the

same vision both in the relation of analogy, or a partial, though general resemblance, and of an exact likeness. Men are indeed employed both on the principle of analogy, as symbols of men of a different sphere, and on the principle of exact likeness, as representatives of men of their own sphere; but it is always in different visions, and necessarily: For as the reason that they are introduced in their own persons and used as symbols of their own order is, that no other agent could represent them in the condition in which they are to be foreshown; so the reason that their acts and conditions are used as representatives of precisely similar acts and conditions, is, that none but precisely such acts and conditions could serve as symbols of those that are to be foreshown.

Secondly: It is demonstrated by the fact, that the dying of the witnesses, their dead bodies, their remaining unburied, and their resurrection and ascension, cannot be symbols of anything else than the dying, being dead, lying unburied, and resurrection and ascension of persons of precisely their office and character. There is no other dying, lying unburied, and rising, which the death, non-burial, and resurrection of the symbol witnesses resembled and can represent. The only death to which that of the body bears an *analogy*, is that of the soul. But the death of the witnesses, who are the servants of God, cannot be a symbol of a *spiritual* death of those whom they represent; for those whom they represent are also servants of God, who prophesy, and utter the testimony of Jesus. The death of the witnesses in obedience, and because of their obedience, does not present an analogy to the apostasy of men, by which they become spiritually dead. Instead of likes, they are blank opposites. It is certain, therefore, from the nature of the symbol, that the dying, the lying unburied, and the resurrection and ascension, that are foreshown, are precisely like those of the slain witnesses by which they are symbolized.

Thirdly: This is demonstrated also by the fact that the killing of the seven thousand men of name denotes a real killing of the men whom they represent. What else than a literal death can this being killed by the fall of the tenth of the city symbolize? It cannot be a spiritual death. The fall of a state has no adaptation to produce such an effect.

The killing of the seven thousand by the fall of the city must undoubtedly represent the real killing of a body of men by the fall of that which the city denotes. Why else should those who survive be struck with fear, and give glory to God? Would the *apostasy* of seven thousand prompt them to such an act? But that the event foreshown is a real corporeal killing, and not an apostasy, is clear from the consideration that the event denoted by the killing is one of which those who suffer it are to be passive subjects, not the voluntary agents, as they would be were it an act of apostasy. The death symbolized, is to be a vengeful infliction, a judgment, not a free act of their own. It must therefore be a corporeal death.

So also the killing of every one that plots to injure the witnesses is a literal killing. The element used as the symbol of the instrument of the death is fire; which indicates that the effect it is to produce, and which is called death, is a real death of the body; and the death represented by that literal death must also be a literal death in some form, inasmuch as from the character of the persons to be slain, their death cannot be a *spiritual* death. They are already the enemies of God and his kingdom, or they would not conspire against his witnesses. The punishment to be inflicted on them is therefore a punishment of them as apostates and enemies; not a mere leaving them to become apostates and enemies.

In these several considerations then—that all the other human representatives in the vision are used as symbols of men of their own orders; that the witnesses themselves are certainly used in that relation in their prophesying; that there are no other events and states which their dying, lying unburied, and resurrection, can be employed to symbolize, than precisely such events and states themselves; and finally, that the killing of those who would injure the witnesses and of the seven thousand men, is unquestionably used as the symbol of the actual killing of men—we have the most abundant certainty that the persons symbolized by the witnesses, are real witnesses precisely like the symbols themselves, and that the events symbolized by their slaughter, lying unburied, resurrection and ascension, are a real corporeal slaughter, lying unburied, resurrection and ascension, of

•

the same kind as those that are used as the representatives.

In this, however, the writers whom we have mentioned, do not concur. They deny that the slaughter, non-burial, resurrection, and ascension of the witnesses in the vision, are symbols of a like slaughter, non-burial, rising, and ascent of those whom they represent; and maintain that they are used as symbols of a different set of events and states; and that the slaying of the witnesses denotes simply their being silenced, or intercepted from the utterance of their testimony; their lying unburied, their being kept in that state of interception and silence; and their resurrection and ascent to heaven, their restoration to the liberty of testifying and exaltation to a level with their persecutors in religious and civil freedom; and they regard the prediction as having long since had its accomplishment, though they refer it to different epochs and different events.

Mr. Elliott assigns the slaughter to the year 1514; represents the slaughterer as the Lateran Council, instead of the wild-beast; holds that the Bohemians, who rejected many of the errors of the papacy, were the slain; and that the resurrection was the commencement of the Reformation by Luther, in 1517.

Mr. Cuninghame assigns their slaughter to 1548. He says:

"The death of the witnesses took place when they were silenced and compelled to desist from bearing testimony. This was effected by the promulgation of the Interim in the year 1548. The bodies of the slain witnesses were not, however, to be laid in graves. The refusal of the rites of sepulture seems to imply the highest degree of insult, and points out to us the obloquy which was everywhere cast on the name and faith of the Protestants. It had even a literal fulfilment in the cruel treatment of the Landgrave of Hesse and the Elector of Saxony by the Emperor Charles V. They were carried about by him as captives in his progress through Germany, exhibited as a public spectacle in its principal cities, and thus their disgrace and the triumph of the Emperor were every day renewed."—*The Souls and Trumpets*, p. 144.

Their resurrection and ascension, he holds, were accomplished in the recovery of their liberty of speech and worship,

about three and a-half years after, through the defeat of the Emperor by Maurice, and the treaty of Passau, by which the Protestants were legally established and placed under the protection of the civil government.

Mr. Faber refers the slaughter to the expulsion of a portion of the Waldenses from their territory in 1686, and holds that their resurrection was their recovery of their valleys by arms in 1690, and their ascent to heaven, their legal toleration soon after by the Duke of Savoy.

These writers thus wholly discard the prediction of a literal martyrdom and resurrection of the persons represented by the slain witnesses, and maintain that their death is a symbol of the *silencing* of those whom they represent, by a legal prohibition of their preaching, or an expulsion from their territory; and their resurrection a symbol of their restoration to the right and power of testifying without obstruction. Their constructions, however, are confuted by a great variety of considerations. There is not indeed a single relation in which they are tenable.

1. It is impossible that the death of the symbol witnesses can represent a mere silencing of living preachers, or prevention from uttering their testimony; as there is no analogy between them. The only point in which they resemble each other, is in the discontinuance of their testimony. But that does not involve any analogy or general likeness of its cause or nature. The cause and nature of the discontinuance of the utterance of the Bohemians, Germans, and Waldenses, was wholly unlike those of the slain witnesses. In the latter, there was a loss of the physical power of utterance by the death of the body. There was no such loss of the natural power of speech by the Bohemians, Germans, or Waldenses. Their silence, as far as they ceased to speak, was from the impulse of strong motives, and was entirely voluntary. It bore no more resemblance to death, than the discontinuance of speaking by public teachers does on any other occasion, and for any other sufficient motive. But what could be more preposterous than to use death as a symbol of the silence to which a member of the national legislature is constrained by a rule limiting the time during which an individual may speak in a debate to a half hour, or of the silence to which a speaker is put, when interrupted in his

harangue by an assembly, because they are unwilling to hear him longer, or prefer to listen to a different orator? It presents no more analogy to death, than a person's prevention, by means which address themselves to the will, from any other mode of action. Would it be thought appropriate to use death as a symbol of a person's being hindered from labor in his field by a storm; from going to sea by a head wind; or from taking a journey by the breaking of his carriage? Yet the cases are precisely parallel. The prevention of the dissentients from the Romish church, by threats and legal prohibitions, from preaching the gospel, bears no more resemblance to death, than the prevention does of persons from either of those or similar modes of agency; no more than the prevention of persons by threats of imprisonment and injury from entering Japan, or passing into the interior of China. Being put to death by the sword is as unlike a living person's voluntary refraining from speaking, as it is from a living person's refraining from any other kind of action, or from existing in any other mode in which all his faculties are retained, and all the natural functions of his mind and body exercised. The fancy, therefore, that the alleged silence of the Bohemians, Germans, and Waldenses, is the proper counterpart of the death of the witnesses, and the event which it naturally denotes, is altogether mistaken. No two things are more totally unlike in nature, cause, and all attendant conditions; while their only point of resemblance is the mere cessation from a particular mode of action, which alone is no basis whatever for symbolization.

2. This is confirmed, in the most decisive manner, by the usage of the symbolic Scriptures, in which, in all instances, the killing of animals by beasts, and killing of men by Christ at his advent, denote the literal killing of the men whom the slain symbols represent. Thus the devouring of much flesh by the bear, Daniel vii. 5, symbolizes the slaughter of many men by the Persian monarch and his armies, whom the bear represents; and the devouring and breaking in pieces by the fourth beast, Dan. vii. 7, 19, symbolizes the crushing and devouring of the nations by the Roman monarchs and armies, whom that beast represents. The smiting and trampling down of the ram, Dan. viii. 7, denotes the conquest and slaughter of Darius and his army, of whom the

ram is the symbol; the breaking of the great horn of the goat, represents the death of Alexander and his offspring, whom that horn symbolizes; and the slaying of the wild-beast of ten horns, and casting it into the burning flame, Dan. vii. 11, Rev. xix. 20, denotes the literal destruction of the monarchs and subordinate rulers, whom that beast symbolizes.

In like manner, the killing of men by the monster horses, Rev. ix. 13-21, denotes the literal killing of men by the Turks, whom those horses and their riders represent; and, finally, the slaying of the kings and their armies at the great battle at Armageddon by Christ and his hosts, symbolizes the literal killing of the monarchs and men whom those kings and their armies represent. As the killing by symbolic beasts, whether of animals or men, and the killing of the beast and of men by Christ, in all instances symbolizes the literal killing of human beings, the slaughter of the witnesses by the wild-beast of ten horns must be also taken as representing a literal slaughter of those whom the witnesses represent. To assign it another meaning, is as contradictory to the usage of the symbolic Scriptures, as it is to the principles of symbolization.

8. But there was not any such interception of the Bohemians, Germans, or Waldenses, from the utterance of their testimony, as these writers suppose. There is not the slightest proof or indication that the Bohemians were not at as entire liberty to preach, after the assembling of the Lateran Council, as they had been before, and that they did not continue to utter their testimony with as little obstruction as they had for a considerable period. That Council did not enact any decree compelling, or attempting to compel them to silence. There is not even an allusion to them in the legislative acts of that body. Nor were the Protestants of Germany reduced to silence by the Interim. So far from it, it occasioned the most vehement disputes and met a violent resistance, and a great number of preachers, especially in Saxony, continued to teach without reserve their peculiar doctrines, and observe their peculiar rites. Instead of a dead silence, the whole Protestant body continued in agitation and ferment, till the Interim was suspended by the treaty of Passau. Neither were the Waldenses reduced to



silence by their expulsion from their valleys in 1686. Instead, they were in as absolute liberty in their dispersion in Switzerland and Germany to utter their sentiments, as they had been anterior to their exile. And they in fact delivered their testimony whenever they chose, and in a voice that rang through the whole of Europe.

The fancy that there was any such absolute silencing of those witnesses at either of those epochs, is thus altogether mistaken. There was nothing in the condition of either of the nations in question, at that time, that answers to such an effect. If then those writers were justified in assuming that the death of the witnesses in the vision is a symbol of the mere preventing of witnesses from uttering their testimony, by threats and legal enactments, they are in error in supposing that the prediction had its fulfilment at the periods to which they refer it; as there was no such suppression of the testimony of the Bohemians, Germans, and Waldenses at those epochs. Their application of the prophecy is as inconsistent with the facts of history, as their construction is with the laws of symbolization.

4. If such an obstruction to the utterance of a testimony, as those writers suppose, were the event denoted by the slaying of the witnesses, there still would be no adequate evidence that either of the attempts to silence the proclamation of the gospel to which they refer it, is that which the prediction foreshows; inasmuch as there have been many other epochs in which the teachers of the truth were subjected to equal obstruction, and reduced in as large a measure to silence. There was a score of instances in which the Huguenots of France were repressed by far more violent restraints, and breathed their protest against the false doctrines and impious rites of Rome at greater hazards. There were many instances in which far more vehement and efficient measure were employed to silence the voices of the Protestant teachers in Hungary. Those of England were subjected much more severe restraints during the reign of Mary; the of England and Scotland, under Charles I., and those Holland, under Philip II. of Spain. If therefore the construction placed on the death of the witnesses by the writers were correct, there still would be no proof that prediction had its fulfilment in either of the events

which they refer it; as there are numerous other epochs and events which would be equally entitled to be considered as that which is denoted by the prophecy.

5. Their construction is shown to be wholly mistaken also, by the consideration that the persons denoted by the witnesses had not at those periods finished their testimony. Their slaughter is to take place when they are on the point of completing their testimony. The prediction is, that "When they would finish their testimony, the wild beast which ascends out of the abyss will make war on them, and will vanquish them, and will kill them." This translation is an exact counterpart of the original. The verb *τιλῶσιν* is the first aorist subjunctive, not a future past, nor an equivalent to it, as it is sometimes rendered; and indicates that it is to be when the witnesses are delivering their testimony for the last time, that the war is to be made on them by the beast; and seems to imply that they are to be aware that it is to be their last utterance of their witness for Christ, and is to be followed by their persecution, slaughter, and resurrection from death. And this is confirmed by the conduct of the peoples and tribes, and tongues and nations towards them. The reason that those who go to look on them, refuse them a burial, preserve them in a public place, where they can be inspected through the three and a half years of their lying dead, and assembling at the place at the time when that period expires, doubtless is, that they may see the issue of the expectation expressed by the witnesses themselves and their friends, that they are to be raised from death at the end of three years and a half, openly recognised by God as his servants, and called to ascend to him in the clouds. Those measures will be without any intelligible aim, if no belief is entertained and expressed by the witnesses and their party, that their death is to be followed by a resurrection. But they will be rendered natural, if such a belief is common to the martyrs and their friends, and is openly proclaimed by them as founded on this prophecy. The hope and persuasion that they shall confute the faith of the martyrs, and convict them of delusion and falsehood, will prompt their enemies to conform all their measures to the conditions of this prophecy; putting all whom they slaughter, to death at the same time, preserving them un-

buried in a public place where they can be watched, and all needful precautions taken against their being removed, and a report falsely spread that they have been restored to life and taken up to heaven; and finally, the gathering of a crowd at the predicted time of their resurrection, that the failure may be so amply witnessed and verified, as to place the error of the prophecy or the construction of it by the martyrs, for ever out of doubt.

The witnesses are undoubtedly, then, to enter on the utterance of their testimony, with the persuasion that their epoch is that which is contemplated by this prophecy; that they are in that testimony to finish their witness against the apostate church; that it is to lead to their persecution and martyrdom; and that they are, at the end of three years and a half, to be raised from death and ascend to heaven. And this wholly confutes the supposition that their slaughter took place in 1514, 1548, or 1686, as no such belief was held by the Bohemians, the Germans, or the Waldenses, of the corresponding periods, and no steps answering to the prediction were then taken by the civil power or people to prevent a false report of the restoration of witnesses to life or liberty:—What harm could have resulted to the civil or ecclesiastical persecutors from such false reports? And finally, there was no completion then of the testimony of the witnesses for the truth. They continued to proclaim the great doctrines of the gospel, and have through every successive period with as much freedom as before.

6. The error of their constructions is further apparent from the consideration, that the beast by which the witnesses are to be slain, had not then risen from the abyss. The beast by which they are to be put to death is not the beast from the sea, which was to receive power through forty and two months, but the beast from the abyss, or in the form it is to assume after the fall of the monarchies that have subsisted since the institution of the ten Gothic kingdoms, and the rise of an eighth king or imperial head of the empire, and ten subordinate kings who are to give their power to him, and unite with him in counsel in his war on the kingdom of Christ. But the government of the western empire had not assumed that form in 1514, 1548, or 1686; nor has it to the present time. The slaughter of the witnesses, therefore,

which it is to perpetrate, cannot have taken place at those periods.

7. And finally, the proof of their error is completed by the fact, that no fall of the Turkish power took place soon after 1517, 1551, or 1690, the periods to which these writers refer the restoration of the witnesses to life. The prophecy announces on the ascent of the raised witnesses to heaven, that the second woe, by which is meant the domination of the Turks over the Christian population of the eastern empire—is passed. Had, therefore, the resurrection of the witnesses taken place in 1517, 1551, or 1690, it would have speedily been followed by the fall of the Turkish empire, and the extrication of the churches of the Greek, Armenian, Nestorian, and other communions, from its domination. No such events, however, occurred at those epochs, or have since. The Turkish empire still stands, and is still exercising a cruel and debasing tyranny over its Christian population.

It is thus apparent that the views entertained of the prediction by Cuninghame, Faber, and Elliott, are wholly incorrect. There is not a single feature of their constructions that is not totally erroneous, and against the plainest teachings of the prophecy. Whether we look to the principles of analogy, to the usage of the Scriptures, or to the nature of the events that are to precede, attend, and follow, the death of the witnesses, the evidence is resistless, that they have entirely misconceived and misrepresented the prediction.

How now is it that they fell into this extraordinary misinterpretation, and with an undoubting persuasion of their accuracy? It was obviously from their supposing that a resemblance of any kind, in a single particular, is a sufficient basis for symbolization. They plainly proceed on the assumption that a general correspondence of the symbol and that which it represents, is not necessary, but that all that the killing of the witnesses can denote, is a mere prevention of those whom they represent from uttering their testimony. They found their interpretation, accordingly, on the mere resemblance between a person's being induced by penal enactments and threats voluntarily to discontinue speaking; and a person's being deprived by slaughter of the physical power of speaking, which involves no resemblance whatever in the agencies that are exerted on them, the states into which

they are put, or the grounds of their silence. The likeness that subsists between them is thus of the slightest and vaguest character, and presents no basis whatever for symbolization. It might as well be pretended that a person who voluntarily shuts his eyes, stops his ears, stretches himself at length on the ground, or discontinues the use of his hands, presents a counterpart to a person who is divested by death of the *power* of seeing, hearing, standing erect, or moving his limbs; as that an analogy subsists between one who voluntarily refrains from publicly addressing his fellow men, and one whose silence is the consequence of his being put to death. Had these writers considered that a general correspondence of that which is represented, with that which symbolizes it, is necessary:—that not only must agents denote agents, but acts must represent acts, states must represent states, effects effects, and conditions conditions; that each of the things represented must be in its sphere, what that is in its sphere by which it is represented; and that the events and conditions, therefore, that are foreshown of those who are symbolized by the slain witnesses, must answer in all respects to the witnesses dying, lying dead, and being raised, so that the two correspond either exactly or analogically throughout,—they would not have run into so wild and crude a misinterpretation of the prophecy.

Their treatment of the passage thus indicates in a striking manner their want of any clear and just notion of the principles of symbolization, and of any settled rule of interpretation. Had they had either, they would not have failed to see the untenableness of their construction. There are few of the symbolic visions that contain in themselves more ample means of showing the nature of the events that are revealed in them.

It is indisputable that the wild beast from the abyss is the symbol of the civil rulers of the Western Roman Empire. These writers themselves either directly or virtually admit it. It is equally certain that the acts of the beast in making war on the witnesses, vanquishing, and killing them, symbolize acts which those rulers are to exert on the persons whom the witnesses denote. What kind of actions, then, of the rulers on the persons represented by the witnesses, do those acts of the beast on the witnesses themselves sym-

bolize? The act of making war or persecuting, and vanquishing or bringing them under their power, denote, it is admitted on all hands, a real, literal persecution and vanquishing. That is the interpretation given to those acts by these writers. They hold that it was by a literal assault, defeat, and triumph over the persons symbolized by the witnesses, that they were reduced, as they suppose, to silence. There are no analogous acts, which they can, consistently with the character of the witnesses, be taken to denote. They cannot mean that the persons on whom they were exerted, were converted to the faith of the rulers, and became their partisans and abettors. Their death cannot represent such a change of faith, disposition, and action. They indicate, therefore, that the rulers were to exert just such actions in kind and effect towards those symbolized by the witnesses, as the acts of the beast were, which he exerted in making war on, and vanquishing the witnesses themselves. But if those two acts of the beast denote a literal making war on the witnesses, or persecution of them, and a literal vanquishing them, or depriving them of the means of self-protection, and subjection of them to the power of the rulers: then the beast's act of killing the witnesses must also symbolize a similar act in kind and effect of the rulers towards the persons whom the slain witnesses represent. No other construction is admissible. No reason can be given why this act should be taken as symbolizing an act differing from itself, any more than the act of making war and vanquishing should. Killing is the only act that is in harmony with the acts of war and conquest of which it is the sequel: and death is the only result consistently with the character of the persons who are the subjects of it, to which the persecution and conquest of them could contribute. The killing their bodies cannot symbolize the subjection of their souls to a spiritual death—which would be its import, if it were used on the principle of analogy—as those on whom the effect denoted by killing is to be produced, are the servants of God, who are to be raised from death in glory and taken up to heaven; and do not, therefore, and cannot apostatize, or become spiritually dead. As then it is absolutely certain from the dying of the witnesses *as God's servants*, and from their subsequent acceptance by him, that their death cannot

symbolize a spiritual death of those whom they represent, or any similar change of their souls, it is indisputably clear that the beast's act of killing, like its act of war and vanquishing, denotes an act of the rulers of identically the same kind, and that the death it occasions, is a corporeal death of the same kind as that of the slain witnesses by which it is represented.

The other symbols of the passage are of a nature that renders their import equally indisputable, and confirms that construction. Thirteen of these, besides the witnesses, are human persons: 1. The Gentiles. 2. The worshippers in the temple. 3. Any man who wills to injure the witnesses. 4. Those who go to gaze at their dead bodies. 5. The people. 6. The tribes. 7. The tongues. 8. The nations. 9. They that dwell on the earth. 10. They on whom fear fell when they saw the resurrection of the witnesses. 11. Their enemies who beheld their ascent in the cloud. 12. The seven thousand men of name who were slain by the fall of the tenth of the city. 13. The remnant who were affrighted and gave glory to the God of heaven. And in each of these thirteen cases, the persons used as the symbol, unquestionably represent human beings of their own order. The Gentiles of necessity symbolize Gentiles. Who else can they represent? There are no other inhabitants of the globe whom they can denote. Whom can the offerers of worship in the temple denote, if it be not offerers of worship in the places which the temple symbolizes? Whom can any man who wills to injure the witnesses represent, if it be not any man who actually wills to injure them? To attempt to make any other intelligent being, the party symbolized and threatened with death by fire proceeding from the mouth of the witnesses, would be to convert the prophecy into a jargon of inconceivabilities and contradictions. Whom do those who go to gaze on the dead bodies symbolize, if it be not individuals of the peoples, tribes, tongues, and nations? Are there any other persons whom they can represent? And whom do the peoples, tribes, tongues, and nations to whom those individuals belong, represent, if it be not the real people, tribes, tongues, and nations of the earth? No one will be so absurd as to pretend that they can symbolize any other order of beings than themselves. So also the dwellers on

the earth; they who are struck with fear at the resurrection of the witnesses; their enemies who see their ascent to heaven; the seven thousand men who are killed by the fall of the city; and the rest who become afraid and give glory to God, severally represent men of their own order and condition, as there are no other beings whom they can represent. This makes it certain, therefore, that the witnesses also symbolize men of their own order and condition; that is, witnesses for God, who proclaim his word, and in circumstances that induce the rulers who are symbolized by the wild beast, to make war on them, and vanquish them. Why in the face of the fact, that all the other human beings that are used as symbols in the vision are symbols of persons of their own class and condition, can it be claimed that the witnesses are not? There not only is no imaginable reason for it, but it is against the law of the vision, and against the principles on which men are always employed as symbols in circumstances like theirs, where no other symbol can represent their peculiar acts, affections, and conditions.

But the fact that the human symbols in these thirteen instances represent human beings of their own class and condition, makes it certain also that the acts that are severally foreshown of them, are acts of the same species as those of the symbols themselves by which they are severally represented. This is so certain, indeed, as to admit of no dispute. What can the treading of the holy city symbolize, but a precisely similar treading of the places which the city represents? There is no imaginable act of a different kind which it can be supposed to denote. What can the offering of worship in the temple symbolize, but the offering of worship by those represented by the temple worshippers, in the places symbolized by the temple? No one will attempt to assign it any other meaning. What can a man's injuring the witnesses symbolize, but a man's actually injuring them? Will any undertake to attach to it a different import? What can the looking by the individuals from the nations upon the dead bodies represent, except a literal looking on them? Can ingenuity itself devise any other act which it can represent? What can the rejoicing of the dwellers on the earth, and making merry, and sending gifts to one another, denote, if it be not a literal rejoicing and making



merry, and sending gifts? Are there any other acts which it can without the utmost absurdity be pretended they represent? What can the fear with which those were struck who saw the resurrection of the witnesses, symbolize, if it be not a real fear? Is there anything else which it can possibly represent? What can their enemies beholding the ascent of the witnesses denote, if it is not a real beholding them? What can the killing of the seven thousand men by the falling of the tenth of the city symbolize, if it be not a real killing of men? And finally, what can the flight of the rest, and their giving glory to God symbolize, if it be not a real flight and giving glory? There are no different acts which they can be supposed on the ground of analogy to represent. It is preposterous to imagine that in any of these instances the represented act is of a different kind from the act of the symbol by which it is represented. To attempt to make them representative of a different kind of acts, were to involve the prophecy in inextricable confusion and contradiction.

But the fact that all these symbolic acts and affections of the other human symbols of the vision, thus represent acts and affections precisely like themselves, makes it certain that the acts and affections of the witnesses also in prophesying, and in dying, represent acts and affections of the same nature as themselves; and therefore that the event foreshown of the symbolized witnesses is a violent death of the same kind as the corporeal death of the symbol witnesses. And as their death is to be real and literal, so also must their lying unburied, their resurrection, and their ascension be. These must of necessity be interpreted as used on the same principle of exact likeness, as the other human symbolic acts and affections. No reason can be given for construing them on a different principle. And there are no other states and events that bear to them an analogy.

The vision is thus framed in such a manner, as, when thoroughly analysed, to furnish the most ample means of determining its signification; and to render it absolutely impossible, without contradicting the principles on which all its symbols are used, to interpret the death, non-burial, resurrection and ascension of the witnesses, as denoting anything else than the literal death, non-burial, resurrection and ascension

of those whom they symbolize. It is unquestionably one of the most clear and indubitable of the revelations that are made by the prophecy.

The misinterpretation of this vision led the writers to whom we have referred, and others, to a variety of other extraordinary errors, and involved their judgment of other parts of the prophecy in mistake. Thus on the ground of it, Mr. Cuninghame, Mr. Faber, and Mr. Elliott, imagined that the second woe, which has not yet passed away, reached its end in 1697. Mr. Cuninghame and many others held that the period denoted by the 1260 days—and which has not yet expired if reckoned from the complete nationalization of the churches of the ten kingdoms—terminated in 1789; that the seventh trumpet then sounded, that all the great events that are to precede the coming of Christ have had their accomplishment, and that consequently his advent may be expected at any hour. These mistakes have led to much misapprehension and fanaticism in respect to the events of the last twenty-five years, and are at present exerting a misleading influence on a large share of millenarians, especially abroad; who seem indeed likely to continue to cherish many false expectations, till the great catastrophes and revolutions that are to precede the persecution of the witnesses, or possibly that persecution itself, shall open their eyes to the true signification of the prophecy. On the other hand, the misconstruction by many antimillenarians, of the death of the witnesses, as denoting a mere obstruction or silencing of them, has led them into the erroneous belief, that it has already been accomplished, and that no further persecution is to take place anterior to the conversion of the nations. There is no part of the Apocalypse of which a mistaken interpretation leads more directly to a misunderstanding also of the nature of the predicted occurrences that are immediately to precede and follow it.

The exposition given by commentators generally of the sixth vial, is founded on the same mistaken notion of the principle of symbolization.

“And the sixth angel poured his vial into the great river Euphrates; and its water was dried up, that the way might be prepared of the kings who are from the sun-rising.”—*Rev. xvi. 12.*

Babylon, the great and splendid capital of Babylonia, which is used in this prophecy as a symbol of the apostate nationalized hierarchies of the church, was situated on the Euphrates—the river passing through it, and dividing it into nearly equal parts. Surrounded by a wall of great height and strength, and being found by the Medes and Persians under Cyrus to be impregnable by a direct assault on its ramparts, they gained access to it by the diversion of the river some distance above into a basin excavated for the purpose; so that the besieging army marched along its vacant channel and ascending the stairways that led up from the water on either side, entered through the open gates and conquered the city. That drying of the Euphrates by which the way of the kings of the east, Cyrus and Darius, was prepared for the entrance and conquest of the capital of Babylonia, is the basis of the symbol of this vial. That which the Euphrates represents, bears the same relation to the body denoted by the Babylon of the prophecy, which the real Euphrates bore to the real Babylon which stood on its banks, was sustained by its waters, and nourished by its commerce. The event symbolized by the drying up of the water of the river, bears the same relation to the conquest and destruction of that which is denoted by the Babylon of the prophecy, as the drying of the real Euphrates by Cyrus bore to the conquest of the real Babylon. Those denoted by the kings of the east, for whom the drying of the river is to prepare the way, are to stand in the same relation to the conquest of that which the symbol Babylon denotes, as that in which Cyrus and Darius stood to the conquest of the literal Babylon. But the Babylon of the prophecy denotes the nationalized hierarchies of the church—especially the Catholic—and not improbably, at the time when the vision has its accomplishment, the Catholic will be the only hierarchies in the ten kingdoms that will be nationalized. The Euphrates must accordingly denote some body or power that sustains a relation to the nationalized hierarchies, that is like that which the Euphrates bore to the city Babylon which stood on its banks—that is, a body or power from which they derive their nourishment, their wealth, and their security. What is there then that sustains such a relation to the nationalized hierarchies? The answer is, the peoples and na-

tions that are under their jurisdiction, from whom they derive their support and their power. And this is rendered certain by the fact, that waters are interpreted in the prophecy as the symbols of peoples, nations, and languages, *that are the vassals of the woman Babylon*, who is also used in the prophecy as the symbol of the nationalized hierarchies. "And the waters which thou sawest, where the harlot—Babylon the great—sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." (Chap. xvii. 15.) As the waters in that vision, on the margin of which the woman Babylon sat, thus symbolize the multitudes that are subject to her sway, so in this vision, the waters of the Euphrates that ran through the literal Babylon, must denote the people and nations that are subject to the jurisdiction of the hierarchies whom the material Babylon represents. There is no room for doubt in respect to this construction, any more than there would be if the interpretation of the waters where the woman sat, had been expressly given here as the meaning of the waters of the Euphrates. As the waters in each instance stand in the same relation to Babylon, how can it be supposed that that which the waters represent does not stand in the same relation to the symbolized Babylon? The drying of the Euphrates, therefore, by the vial must denote the diversion or alienation from the nationalized hierarchies of the populations that are under their jurisdiction; and the preparation thereby for the way of the kings of the east must symbolize an equivalent preparation of the way by which the chiefs whom the kings of the east represent, are to conquer the hierarchies of which Babylon is the symbol.

On these symbols, however, commentators generally, both millenarian and antimillenarian, place a wholly different construction. They seem not to have suspected that the Euphrates has any relation to the Babylon of the prophecy, and that its drying up is to prepare the way for the fall of that city which is foretold in the vision of the eighteenth chapter. Instead, they interpret it as a symbol of the Turks or Turkish power. Thus Mr. Cuninghame says:

"A great river, in the language of symbols, denotes a great and populous nation. Now it is held by all the ablest writers on the Apocalypse, that the river Euphrates, in the sixth trumpet, signifies

the nation of the Ottomans. This interpretation rests, indeed, not on human conjecture, but on the authority of the written word. The prophet Isaiah, speaking in the name of the Lord, tells the Jewish church, that the waters of the river strong and mighty, that is the river Euphrates, denote the king of Assyria and all his glory. Consistency, therefore, requires that the symbol should, both in the sixth trumpet and the vial, be equally applied to the Turks or Ottomans, since they possess the territories of ancient Assyria. The drying up or evaporation of the waters of the Euphrates points out to us the gradual decay of the Ottoman empire by a species of internal consumption, and not its overthrow by a hostile invasion; for the figure in the last case would be the turning of the waters of the Euphrates into blood. It is sufficiently apparent, that for many years past the Turkish power has been hastening to its dissolution by an internal decay of its resources, and of all the principles of political health. It would also appear, that its destruction is hastening on with more rapid progress by the immediate hand of God, which is visible for some years past in the dreadful ravages of the plague. We have evidence before our eyes, therefore, that this vial has long since begun to be poured out in the mystic Euphrates. Who the kings of the east, or the kings from the rising of the sun, are, for whom a way is to be prepared by the exhaustion of the waters of the Euphrates, is not yet certain. As the event is yet future, the accomplishment only can throw light upon it. The general opinion is that by the kings of the east, the Jews are intended; but the late venerable Granville Sharpe was of opinion that the risen martyrs of the first resurrection are designated by the appellation. I myself feel inclined to adopt the former opinion, but I do not wish to speak with confidence of the manner of the accomplishment of what is yet future."—Pp. 431, 432.

This construction, however, though exhibiting agents—the river and the kings from the sun-rising—as agents; and events—the drying of the waters, and preparing the way of the kings—as symbolizing events, is yet altogether erroneous.

1. The reason he gives for it, drawn from the sixth trumpet, is mistaken. He says, "It is held by all the ablest writers on the Apocalypse that the river Euphrates in the sixth trumpet signifies the nation of the Ottomans." But that is undoubtedly an error. The river is not there exhibited as overrunning Syria, Egypt, Asia Minor, Eastern Europe, and Northern Africa, as it would have been, had it been the sym-

bol of the Turks. Instead; the two myriads of myriads of the armies of horsemen are the symbols of the Turks, who, coming from beyond the Euphrates, invaded, conquered, and devastated the eastern Roman empire. The Euphrates was, at the time the revelation was made, the boundary of the empire in the east, and was a barrier against invasion; and it was *at* that river, that is, *on its bank*, that the four angels who symbolize the leaders of the four great hosts of the Turkish invaders, were bound. Its *bank*, therefore, is the symbol of a *place*, or a *barrier* at the boundary of the empire, not of a *nation*, engaged at that boundary in repelling an invading army. If moreover the river were used in the latter relation, it would symbolize the population of the *Saracen* empire *west* of the Euphrates who *opposed* the incursions of the Turks, not the Turks themselves, who coming from the east entered and overran the empire. The unbinding of the four angels at the Euphrates, accordingly, signifies the release of the Turkish hosts from some restraint *at the bank of that river*, the eastern boundary of the Roman empire, which had before been a barrier to their crossing the stream, and extending their conquests through Syria, Asia Minor, and the North of Africa. That use of *the bank of the Euphrates* as the eastern boundary and bulwark of the empire, does not, therefore, imply at all that, in the use of *the river* in the sixth vial, it is employed as a symbol of the Turkish nation. The symbols are different, and are used in a wholly different relation; the one of a place, the other of multitudes and peoples, and nations and languages.

2. The other ground on which he places his construction is equally mistaken; that the waters of the Euphrates are exhibited by Isaiah as a *symbol* of the Assyrian monarch and his army. The waters of the river are not used in that passage as a symbol. The king of Assyria and his glory are merely declared to be the waters of the river by a *metaphor*. "Now, therefore, behold the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river strong and many;—even the king of Assyria and all his glory; and he shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks; and he shall pass through Judah; he shall overflow and go over; he shall reach even to the neck; and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel." Isaiah viii.

7, 8. It is thus by a metaphor that the king of Assyria and his hosts are declared to be the waters of the river, and to be about to rise over all his channels and overflow his banks—that is, to pass out of his own territories into Judea, and spread over all its surface. But the ground on which a metaphor is used, is essentially different from that of a symbol. A metaphor, like a comparison, may be founded on resemblance in *a single particular*; but a symbol must bear a likeness to that which it represents in all its general features. The denomination therefore of the king of Assyria and his army, the waters of the river by a metaphor, by Isaiah, is no ground whatever for the assumption that the river, when employed as a symbol, must also represent the Assyrian monarch and his army. Such an assumption would lead to the most monstrous misconstructions of the sacred word. Does the denomination of Judah “a lion’s whelp,” Gen. xlix. 9, by a metaphor, show that the winged lion, Daniel vii. 4, is a symbol of Judah and his descendants? Does the appropriation of the same term to Dan by a metaphor, Deut. xxxiii. 22, make it incumbent on us to consider that winged lion as a symbol of him also and his descendants? Those who are to be placed on the left hand of the Judge, in the judgment foretold Matt. xxv., are called goats by a metaphor. Does that prove that they are the persons symbolized by the goat, Daniel viii. 21? It does, on the principle on which Mr. Cunningham proceeds in alleging that the Euphrates, when used as a symbol, must denote the same thing as it denotes, Isaiah viii. 7, 8, when employed as a metaphor. He is altogether mistaken, therefore. Its use as a name of the king of Assyria and his armies in one instance, is no reason whatever for the supposition that it is used as the representative of that monarch and people, when employed as a symbol.

3. But apart from that consideration, the Euphrates cannot be considered as the symbol of the Turkish Sultan and his hosts, on the ground that the territory of the Turkish empire is the same as that of the king of Assyria at the time of his invasion of Judea. A large part of the Assyrian empire lay beyond the Tigris, out of the bounds of the present Turkish empire; while nearly the whole of the Turkish empire lies in Western Asia, Northern Africa, and Eastern Europe, wholly out of the limits of the Assyrian

empire. The two are as distinct from each other, and as unlike, as the empire of the Persians, the Greeks, or the Romans was, from that of Assyria. It would be considered as an absurd extravagance to treat the Euphrates as a symbol of the Greeks under Alexander, or of the Romans under Trajan, because the Euphrates and the territories between that and the Tigris belonged to the empires under those princes; yet it would be precisely the same reason as that on which Mr. Cuninghame assumes that the Euphrates, under the sixth vial, is the symbol of the Sultan and his hosts. Or if, instead of that ground, the mere fact that Nineveh, the capital of Assyria, is within the limits of the Turkish empire, is held to be a sufficient reason for denominating the Turks Assyrians, though the people, the government, the religion, and the capital, are wholly different from those of Assyria: then the fact that Babylon, the ancient capital of Babylonia, is within the limits of their empire, is an equally good reason for denominating them Babylonians: and the fact that Alexandria, Seleucia, and Constantinople, are within their jurisdiction, and the latter their capital, is an equal reason for denominating them Greeks. It seems singular that a consideration so obvious, and showing so clearly the error of his construction, did not occur to Mr. Cuninghame.

4. The Turks have no such relation to the hierarchies of the ten kingdoms of western Europe, as the Euphrates had to Babylon. The decay, accordingly, of the Turkish empire can contribute nothing to the fall of those hierarchies. Mr. Cuninghame indeed, and those who concur with him, seem not to be aware that the Euphrates has any connexion with Babylon. It has escaped them that the drying up of the river is to be in order to the fall of a great city. They make the drying of the Euphrates, indeed, the same as the decay and fall of the Turkish empire, and treat the latter as exhausting the scope of the symbol. Of the work to be done by the parties denoted by the kings of the east, for whom the drying of the river is to prepare a way, they appear to have formed no notion. That there is to be a fall of any power besides the Turkish, they are not aware. The end for which the Euphrates is dried; the conquest which the kings of the east are to achieve in consequence of the opening to them of



the channel of the river, is left by them out of view. An extraordinary mistake truly! But that the drying of the Euphrates cannot be the-symbol of the decay of the Turkish power, is apparent from the fact that the decay and fall of that power cannot contribute to the overthrow of the hierarchies symbolized by Babylon. The continued nationalization of those hierarchies is not dependent on the continuance of the Turkish empire. No connexion whatever subsists between them: nor is it conceivable that the fall of that empire should even indirectly involve the fall of those hierarchies. If the Turkish empire falls, it will doubtless fall under the dominion either of a northern or a western power. Suppose it to fall under the dominion of Russia; how could that open a way for the denationalization of the churches of Germany, Italy, France, Spain, and Great Britain? Suppose it to fall under the dominion of Austria, France, and Great Britain; how could its conquest by them affect the nationalization of the churches of these and the other kingdoms of Europe? No one will be so absurd as to imagine such an effect could follow from it.

5. Mr. Cuninghame, and those who concur with him, are in equal error in the supposition that the kings from the sun-rising denote the Jews. The kings from the sun-rising, Cyrus and Darius, are symbols of chieftains who are to lead the hosts under their control to the conquest of the power denoted by Babylon. They are official persons or leaders who head large bodies of men, and to whom the way to the overthrow of the represented Babylon is opened by the alienation from her of the people symbolized by the waters of the river. But the Jews are not such chiefs. To suppose that Cyrus and Darius symbolize the Jews, is to suppose them to be symbols of a nation or people, instead of the kings or chiefs of a people; which is to contradict the principle of symbolization, and assume that no correspondence of station, office, and agency need subsist between the symbol and that which it represents. Besides, who can persuade himself that the Jews of the east or any other quarter are to march into western Europe, and denationalize their state hierarchies? The supposition is as preposterous as it is contradictory to the laws of symbolization.

This construction of the vial is thus altogether untenable.

Though enjoying a general acceptance, there is not a single consideration that yields it any support.

How is it now that these writers fell into so singular a mistake? Simply because they misjudged the principle on which symbols are employed: because they were wholly unaware that a general correspondence must subsist between the representative, and that which it represents; and assumed that likeness in any single respect, no matter with what dissimilarities and contradictions in other particulars it may be associated, is an adequate basis of symbolization. Accordingly, because there is a resemblance between the drying of a great river and the decay of a great people, they assumed that the Euphrates is the symbol of the Turks, and its drying the symbol of their decline in number and power, although they present no counterpart whatever to the other elements of the vision; no Babylon to be made accessible to a besieging host by the evaporation of the waters of the river; and no kings to lead on the invading army. They forget, indeed, that the drying of the river has any reference to the conquest of a Babylon; and assume, that the decay of the Turkish power, instead of a means to such an end, is to terminate altogether in itself. They fail also to see that, if the wasting of the river is the symbol of the decay of a great people, there yet is no evidence whatever that the Turks are the people whom the river represents; that Rome, Venice, Genoa, Spain, Portugal, and several other states that flourished for a period, have either passed away, or sunk into a feebleness and decrepitude as marked as that of the Turks. Had they considered that as both the Euphrates and Babylon are used as symbols in the prophecy, they must necessarily be used in their natural relation to each other, and that therefore whatever it is which the river represents, it must bear such a relation to that which is represented by Babylon, as the literal Euphrates bore to the literal Babylon, and that a general resemblance must subsist throughout between the symbol and that which it denotes, they would not have ventured on a construction so wholly destitute of the requisite correspondencies, and presenting such extraordinary contradictions to the most important teachings of the vision.

These instances exemplify in an emphatic manner, the necessity of interpreting the symbols by their proper laws,

in order to unfold their true meaning. The writers to whom we have referred, have not only been led into the grossest errors by the false principles on which they proceed, but if those principles were granted them, there is not one of their constructions that would have any claim to be received as indisputably true; as there are other events besides those to which they refer them, that have an equal claim to be considered as their fulfilment.

---

#### ART. IV.—THE PARABLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

##### III. THE WHEAT AND THE TARES.

Matthew xiii. 24-30; 36-43.

“AND he put forth another parable to them, saying: The kingdom of heaven is like a man who sowed good seed in his field. But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went away. But when the blade sprung up and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. And the servants of the master of the family came and said to him, Sir, didst thou not sow good seed in thy field? Whence then has it tares? And he said to them, a man [that is] an enemy did this. And the servants said to him: Wilt thou then that we go and gather them? But he said, nay; lest in gathering the tares, you root up the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest: and at the time of the harvest, I will say to the reapers: Gather first the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my garner.”

“Then Jesus having dismissed the multitudes, entered the house. And the disciples came to him saying: Explain to us the parable of the tares of the field. And he answered and said to them: He who soweth the good seed, is the Son of Man; the field is the world; and the good seed are the children of the kingdom. But the tares are the children of the wicked one. The enemy also who sowed

them is the devil. The harvest, moreover, is the end of the age; and the reapers are angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned with fire, so shall it be at the end of this age. The Son of Man shall send his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them who work iniquity; and shall cast them into the furnace of fire. There shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then the righteous shall shine as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father. He who has ears to hear, let him hear."

The kingdom of heaven which is here likened to a man sowing good seed in his field, is not the visible church, as commentators generally represent, but is Christ's kingdom of true disciples here under his sway and the plots against it of the devil. This is seen from the fact that the children of the wicked one, who are represented by the tares, do not belong to the kingdom of heaven; they are only introduced *among* the children of the kingdom; and though they externally bear a semblance to them, it is a mere outward semblance; they are in reality the subjects of a foreign and hostile prince, and are insinuated among the true disciples only for selfish and mischievous purposes.

The scene of this kingdom, it is expressly represented, is *ὁ κόσμος*, this world; the period during which the parable exemplifies it is the present age or dispensation, till Christ comes in the clouds and establishes it in the new form it is to receive, when the righteous dead are to be raised from the grave, and shine in it as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars for ever and ever. (Matt. xiii. 43; Dan. xii. 8; Rev. xx. 4-6; xxii. 3-5.) And the relation in which it is exemplified, is the likeness of Christ's procedure in rearing subjects and conducting his administration over them, under the machinations of the devil, to the procedure of the master of a family, who sowed only good seed in his field, but yet allowed the tares sowed by his enemy to remain and grow with the wheat till the harvest. To interpret the parable, we are to point out the analogy of the several objects, actors, and events in the sphere of the parable to the corresponding objects, actors, and events in the kingdom of heaven which they resemble.

First: The analogy of the master of the family to the Son of Man. The master of the family was the lord

of his household, and of his field. It was his prerogative to direct the labors of his servants, and to determine what course should be pursued in the cultivation of his ground, what seed should be sown, and how it should be treated during the growth of the crop. In like manner, the Son of Man is the monarch of his kingdom on earth. It is his prerogative to determine who shall be constituted children of his kingdom, and to direct the angels, who are his servants in conducting its affairs, what course they are to pursue towards the children of the kingdom, and towards the children of the devil, who are intermixed with them.

Secondly: The analogy of the good seed, to the children of the kingdom. The master of the family sows good seed, and only good seed, wheat—that which produces fruit, and fruit suited to the end for which the field is cultivated. In like manner, the Son of Man constitutes those, and those alone, children of the kingdom, whose character he approves, and who yield the fruits of holiness; which is the end for which he redeems them, and constitutes them members of his kingdom.

Thirdly: The analogy of the enemy of the master of the field, to the devil. The man who sowed the tares, was an enemy to the owner of the field; and his object was both to injure his character, and to obstruct, and if possible destroy his crop. He aimed to bring discredit on him probably, by representing that *he* had sown bad seed in his field, either because he was indifferent what sort of fruit it yielded for the sustenance of his family, or else because he was unable to distinguish between wheat and tares. He hoped also, doubtless, to spoil the crop by rendering it impossible to separate the tares from the wheat; or if they were allowed to remain together, and the whole were used for food, to make the master of the field responsible for all the ill effects that might result from causing his family to eat such noxious bread. So the devil is prompted by enmity to the Son of Man, in introducing his wicked partisans among the children of the kingdom. He attempts to detract from Christ's wisdom and rectitude, by asserting that it is *he*, not his enemy, that introduces the children of the wicked one among the children of the kingdom, and representing that the evil are as acceptable to him as the good. It is his aim to bring

Christ's kingdom, in-appearance, down to a level with his own; and thereby in an equal measure to misrepresent and dishonor him. It is characteristic, accordingly, of false teachers and apostates, the children of the wicked one, that they profess to be the children of the kingdom; and claim the sanction of Christ's authority for their false doctrines and their wicked deeds. Satan has thus ever represented Christ as responsible for all the impious errors and atrocious practices of the apostate church—saint-worship, idolatry, the mass, the legalization of sin, the suppression of the Scriptures, persecution—and thereby cast infinite dishonor on his name; and he, not improbably, has hoped to confound the two so effectually, that no separation could be made of the true from the false, that should not, in appearance at least, be obnoxious to the charge of injustice.

Fourthly: The analogy of the tares to the children of the wicked one. The tare is a Syrian plant, it is generally held, that closely resembles wheat in stalk, leaves, and color; that yields a seed, however, that may be distinguished from wheat, and that is noxious; producing dizziness. The tares therefore, notwithstanding their external resemblance, were essentially different in nature from the wheat; and their intermixture with it was in every relation injurious. It reflected dishonor on the owner of the field, so far as the false belief prevailed that he deliberately sowed the tares with the wheat. They obstructed the growth of the wheat, by usurping a portion of the strength and moisture of the soil; and if the seed was allowed to remain intermixed with the wheat at the harvest, it rendered the use of the wheat itself unsafe, and made the whole unfit either for consumption or sale. They thus present in their sphere a striking resemblance to the children of the wicked one in theirs. The children of the wicked one are radically different from the children of the kingdom, among whom Satan introduces them. They are defined by Christ, in his explanation of the parable, as πάντες οἱ τρώοντες, καὶ τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ανομίαν, they who cause others to stumble, and who practise iniquity, or act lawlessly. They are false teachers therefore, and artful tempters, who betray others into fatal error and revolt, and who disregard, pervert, and set at naught the law of God. They are not harmless, uninfluential persons, but are active and studied

mischief-makers, whose genius and aim are to plot against those around them, and endeavor to betray them to apostasy. They belong accordingly to the class whom Peter denominates "the men that are impious," for whose destruction the earth and air are reserved unto fire. Such, preëminently, has been the character of the corrupt, usurping, and persecuting teachers of the Catholic and Greek churches through every period of their career, and in a large degree also of the crowds whom they have drawn to their ranks and imbued with their principles; and such has been the character of the false teachers of the Protestant church from the Reformation to the present day. Their very business is to cause others to stumble, enthrall themselves in fatal heresies, and plunge into sin; and they themselves exemplify the lawlessness and iniquity into which they lead their disciples. Among them are the deniers of the authority of the Scriptures, the renewing power of the Spirit, the reality of the atonement, the justification of men by grace through faith, the necessity of renovation and pardon, the future punishment of the wicked, the personality of God, and other fundamental truths. Their intermixture with the children of the kingdom would also, like the tares among the wheat, be, if allowed to continue, wholly fatal to the object of the institution of the kingdom. It would be infinitely dishonorable to God, and overcloud for ever the glory of the work of redemption, if he were to accept and treat these children of the wicked one as the genuine children of the kingdom. For as it would be to deliver them from the punishment of sin, without redeeming them from its dominion, it would be to sanction and reward them as evil. It would make the kingdom of God on earth also a source of injury, instead of good, to his other obedient subjects, as it would shroud his perfections in darkness, raise rebellion to a level with obedience in its rewards, and fill his children in every part of his realms with doubt, apprehension, and despair, and betray them not improbably into revolt.

Fifthly: The resemblance of the enemy's procedure, who sowed the tares, to that of Satan in introducing his emissaries among the children of the kingdom. It was while men slept that the enemy of the owner of the field came and sowed the tares. This was chiefly, doubtless, to avoid prevention.

Had he gone in open day to perpetrate the mischief, he would have been observed, and intercepted. The disguise of night, secresy, was indispensable to the success of the first step of his malicious scheme. It was necessary also in order that the presence of the tares might not be discovered till it was too late to root them up, and that he might more successfully propagate the report that it was the owner of the field himself that had sowed them. And it is in like manner by stealth and under the disguise of false names and false professions that Satan introduces his emissaries—the propagators of false doctrines and corrupt principles and manners, into the church. It is when men are asleep; when they are put off their guard by hypocritical professions of the truth, showy pretexts of reformation, and other artful disguises of their real character, that he intrudes his agents among the children of the kingdom. And they are prevented by these arts from suspicion, and remain unaware of what is happening, till it is too late to intercept the mischief. This is exemplified at the present time. Whoever inquires into the history of the false teachers in the churches of this country, who have led trains of followers into fatal error, will find that with scarce an exception they entered the church in the garb of believers and teachers of the very truths which they at length rejected and assailed; and that it was owing to their concealing their real sentiments while they were insinuating them into the minds of their disciples, that the children of the kingdom were prevented from openly opposing them, till they had gained such a body of adherents that their extermination became impossible. Such was the fact with those who deny the deity of Christ; with those who deny God's power to renew or influence the mind, and make that denial the ground of their doctrine, that he cannot exclude sin from his kingdom, or secure any of his creatures from apostasy; with the disciples of Coleridge, Schelling, Schleiermacher, and others of the German pantheistic school, who are now zealously propagating the deadly principles of that scheme; and with the crowd in the Protestant communions who have become disciples of Romanism. Not one of these parties openly avowed their peculiar sentiments at first. The leaders and disciples of the last three are now accustomed to disavow their false doc-



trines and profess the system which they reject, whenever it is thought necessary to lull suspicion, and enable them more securely to retain the positions and reputation that are needed to give diffusion to their errors. Their tactics are notoriously after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness. And in this feature they are distinguished in the clearest manner from the children of the kingdom. No great truth of Christianity was ever introduced into the church by stealth, or after having been lost or forgotten, was ever recalled to the faith of true believers by trick and cabal; and no generation of the pious was ever led into the kingdom by artifice and deception. The children of the kingdom "are the children of the light and the children of the day, not of the night nor of darkness;" they do not need the arts of concealment and treachery for the accomplishment of their purposes.

Sixthly: The analogy of the servants of the master of the family, and the angels. The owner of the field did not indicate any surprise on being informed that tares were intermixed with the wheat which he had sown. He knew that he had an enemy that was capable of endeavoring to injure him by mixing the noxious fruit of that plant with the grain which was to be the food of his household. But his servants, knowing that the seed that was sown by their master was good, were surprised at the appearance of the tares, and seem to have supposed that the wisest course of procedure was immediately to root them out. That it would be best to allow them to grow together till harvest, they did not discern. There is no direct indication by Christ that in these relations, as well as in their office as reapers, they are representatives of the angels. It is not improbable, however, that the angels were in like manner surprised at first at the intermixture of the children of the devil with the children of the kingdom, and that had it been referred to them, they would have thought it best immediately to remove them, and consign them to their appropriate reward. The great ends that are answered by their being allowed to live together, and unfold and display their characters, may not have lain within their grasp. The long delay of the work of redemption, and the gradual steps by which it is accomplished, we are told,

engage their earnest contemplation and study, and excite their wonder.

Seventhly: The analogy of the procedure of the owner of the field, in allowing the tares to remain and grow with the wheat till the harvest, to Christ's permitting the children of the wicked one to live intermixed with the children of the kingdom, through the present age. The reason given by the master of the family for not allowing his servants to attempt to gather the tares from the wheat was, that they would root up the wheat along with them, and would thereby destroy the crop more effectually than the presence of the tares could. And this implies that the separation of the children of the devil from the children of the kingdom during the present age, would require such measures, and involve such an administration as would preclude the great ends that are pursued in this part of the divine administration, of which one of great moment is, the exemplification by severe trials of the principles and affections of the two classes; verification of the grounds on which God proceeds in the work of redemption; and preparation thereby for the gift of renovation and pardon at length to the race at large who are to live during Christ's millennial reign, and through the ages that are to follow the second resurrection, without putting them to similar trials. These great demonstrations are, undoubtedly, as indispensable to the administration that is then to be established, as the continuance of the wheat in the ground was to its growth, flowering, and maturing its fruit, in order to the harvest. For if there were no thorough proof made that those whom God adopts and rewards as his children, are truly such; if they were not placed in circumstances in which they were led to the most decisive manifestations of their fidelity, how would it be seen by the universe who witness his procedure that they are indubitably his children? And if the children of the wicked one were subjected to no trials, by which the contrast of their hearts to those of the children of the kingdom was made apparent, how would it be clear that the judgment they are to receive is not unjust? This proof, which is thus taking place under the present dispensation, that all who are renewed are the true children of God, and that all who remain unrenewed are his enemies, is thus indispensable to the vindication of

the judgments he is to pronounce on those who are subjected to these tests of their character ; and still more to the introduction of the differing administration that is to follow, when men are no longer to be put to such tests, but are to be renewed, and exempted from the assaults of Satan and the corrupting influence of evil men, and maintained in spotless virtue and undisturbed peace.

Eighthly : The analogy of the time of the harvest of the wheat and tares, to the time of the separation and judgment of the two classes of men whom they represent. The harvest of the wheat was to take place when it was ripe. To cut it either earlier or later, would have been to lose the crop. The moment when it had reached perfect maturity, was the time when it was to be reaped in order to secure, in its greatest measure, the objects of its growth. So there is to be a period when the manifestations that are making in the present dispensation will have reached a point, that will make it equally necessary that the Son of Man should come, assume the sceptre of the world, separate the evil from the good that have before lived intermingled with each other, and assign them their several rewards. The ends to be effected by the dispensation of this age will be accomplished, and the way prepared for the far differing and more gracious administration that is to be exercised by Christ in his personal reign ; so that it will be as truly and obviously the fit period for his coming, judging the nations, and placing those who are to live under his millennial sceptre, under a new government, as it was that the time when the wheat had reached maturity, was the proper time for harvesting it and placing it in the garner.

Ninthly : The analogy of the gathering and burning of the tares to the separation and destruction of the children of the wicked one. The reapers, who were the servants of the owner of the field, were the agents in collecting and burning the tares, and in gathering the wheat into the garner. And so at the end of the age, the angels are to be the agents to collect the wicked and consign them to punishment ; and of gathering together the elect also, we are told by Christ, Matt. xxiv. 31, for acceptance and admission into the millennial kingdom. How the tares were to be separated from the wheat, so that no share of the one should remain intermixed

with the other, we are not informed; but as it was to be the work of the reapers, it implies that the two were perfectly distinguishable from each other, and that the reapers were aware of their respective characteristics. So how the angels are to separate the children of the kingdom from the children of the wicked one, we are not told; but as it is to be their work, it implies that the two are to be perfectly distinguishable, and that the angels are to be aware of their respective characteristics.

Tenthly: The resemblance of the disposition that was to be made of the tares and wheat to the rewards of the evil and the righteous. The tares were to be gathered together and burned, as not simply valueless but noxious; while the wheat was to be gathered into the garner, and appropriated to the uses for which it was raised. So the children of the wicked one are to be gathered out of the kingdom, and consigned to punishment, not simply as unsuited to be subjects of the kingdom, but as positively hostile and noxious to it. Of the disposition to be then made of the children of the kingdom nothing is directly said. On the removal of the children of the wicked one from among them, the way <sup>will</sup> be prepared for the institution of the millennial state into which they are to enter. And then *in* that kingdom of which they are the children, the righteous, by whom are doubtless meant the risen and glorified dead, are to "shine as the sun." That the righteous who are then to shine, are not the living children of the kingdom from whom the living wicked are to be separated, is indicated by their shining *in* the kingdom, of which the living nations are to be subjects (Dan. viii. 14, 27). And that they are to be the risen saints is shown Dan. xii. 2, from which it is seen that it is they that be wise, and they that turn many to righteousness, that are to shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars for ever and ever; and therefore that they are to be risen and glorified saints, at least mainly; as those of that character among them will be far more numerous than among the living.

That the risen saints are to reign with Christ in his millennial kingdom, and are to shine with glory—is shown also, 1 Corin. xv. 42-44; Matt. xvii. 2; 2 Peter i. 16; Rev. xx. 4-6.

This parable thus exemplifies all the laws of the figure;

agents representing agents; living things in the sphere of the parable, living beings in the sphere which the parable is employed to illustrate; acts denoting acts; conditions, conditions; characteristics, characteristics; and effects, effects. Its express office is, to illustrate the kingdom of God during the present age or dispensation, and the great truths which it teaches, are:

1. That Satan is waging a war on God and his kingdom, and endeavoring to dishonor and obstruct him in the work of redemption.

2. That he proceeds with great art in his plots; one of the principal means he employs to accomplish his end being, to introduce his treacherous and malignant emissaries among the children of the kingdom, that he may make the kingdom itself apparently unworthy of God, fill it with error and sin, and involve it in apostasy. All the great false teachers in the church, all those who make it their business to tempt others to fatal errors and sins, are his children; no matter who they are, nor what are their professions, their stations, or the communions to which they belong, if they are teaching a false gospel, and betraying men into apostasy, they are the children of the wicked one; they owe their introduction among the children of the kingdom to Satan's agency, and they are working his will. A terrible truth to those who are employing themselves in endeavoring to subvert the great doctrines of the Bible and propagate false systems in their place! Who can doubt that they belong to this class, who are engaged in teaching the impious errors of Romanism? Who can doubt that they belong to it, who are proclaiming the dogmas of modern idealism and pantheism as the doctrines of Christianity, exalting reason above revelation, and making a god of man? Who can doubt that they belong to it, who deny that God is able to constitute men the children of his kingdom by giving them a new character, reject the doctrine of the renovation of the heart by the Holy Spirit, and maintain that the principle from which the saved and the lost act, is identically the same? A terrible truth also to them, who, while professing to reject the errors of these false teachers, yet utter no protest against their perversions and denials of the gospel, but countenance and uphold them in their false

teachings, and claim for them the character of true ministers of Christ! It is not a mark of good husbandmen, not to be able to tell tares from wheat, when their respective characteristics are fully unfolded. It is not a sign of the children of the kingdom, not to be able to distinguish those who belong to their class from the children of the devil!

3. That there are ends to be answered by the present administration in which the evil are allowed to live intermixed with the children of the kingdom, that are as essential in the great scheme of redemption that is to be pursued in the ages that are to follow this, as the continued growth of the tares among the wheat was, to the husbandman's finally securing the crop of grain at which he aimed. And those ends, doubtless, are such demonstrations that the renewed are truly the steadfast children of God, and that the unrenewed are truly his enemies, as will supersede the necessity of a continued proof of it by subjecting them to similar trials after Christ comes, and render it safe to extend salvation to the whole of the nations through the long round of ages denoted by the thousand years of the saints' reign. How worthy of God's wisdom will this great measure of his government which now seems so mysterious then appear! It was in view of it in its relations to the Israelites, that the apostle exclaimed, "O the depth of the riches both of the knowledge and the wisdom of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!"—Rom. xi. 33.

4. This intermixture of the children of the wicked one with the children of the kingdom, is to continue through the present age, which is to terminate at Christ's second coming, and only to that time. The wicked are then to be gathered from among the children of the kingdom, and consigned to destruction; and no others are thereafter to be substituted in their place; and because Satan himself, also, is then to be bound and imprisoned in the abyss, and no longer be able to seduce the nations, and introduce his emissaries among the true worshippers—Rev. xx. 1-3—all people, nations, and languages are then to become obedient to the reign of Christ, and the world be filled with righteousness and peace.

5. The parable teaches therefore in the most explicit manner, that the conversion of the nations and redemption of

the world is not to take place under the present dispensation, or anterior to Christ's second advent. No separation of the evil from the children of the kingdom is to take place till he comes. They are to continue intermixed, as they now are, and have been through the ages that are passed, till that epoch. The nominal church is in a large measure to be antichristian; it is to be crowded with false teachers and doers of iniquity, as it has been from generation to generation for eighteen centuries; and then these hostile hosts, instead of being converted, are to be gathered out of the kingdom, and consigned to the realms of despair. The notion generally entertained, that the millennium is to be introduced by a gradual conversion of the world by the agencies that are now used for the spread of the gospel, not only has no authority from the word of God, but is in the most open contradiction to its explicit teachings.

6. The kingdom of heaven is, after Christ's advent, still to continue in this world, and to assume a far more glorious form. There is not a hint in the parable, nor in any other part of the word of God, that it is then to be transferred to another sphere; but Christ expressly teaches that it is *in this kingdom* out of which the tares are to be gathered, that the righteous are then to shine as the sun: and it is foreshown in Daniel vii. 13, 14, that Christ is then to assume the throne of this world, that all people, nations, and languages may serve him; and that his kingdom here is to continue for ever and ever.

#### IV. THE MUSTARD SEED.

Matt. xiii. 31, 32. Mark iv. 30-32. Luke xiii. 18, 19.

"And he put forth another parable to them, saying: The kingdom of heaven is like a grain of mustard seed which a man took and sowed in his field; which indeed is the least of all seeds; but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, so that the birds of the air come and pitch their tents [that is, build their nests] in the branches of it." Matt. xiii. 31, 32. "And he said: To what shall we liken the kingdom of God, or with what similar thing shall we compare it? It is like a grain of mustard seed, which when it is

sown in the earth is less than all the seeds that are [sown] in the earth. But when it is sown it grows up and becomes the greatest of all the herbs, and puts out great branches, so that the fowls of the air may erect their tents [that is, build their nests] under its shade." Mark iv. 30-32.

This parable is designed to exemplify the kingdom of heaven in a different relation from that of the wheat and tares. That shows that the children of the wicked one are to continue mixed with the children of the kingdom through the whole of the present dispensation; at the close of which Christ is to come. The disciples might therefore have inferred from it, perhaps, that the kingdom of heaven was to remain in a very feeble and depressed condition throughout that long period. To preclude that apprehension, Christ teaches in this parable that though it was to be small at its commencement, it was gradually to advance in size, and at length to become great and powerful. The points of its resemblance are its smallness at its institution; the magnitude to which it was to rise; and the shelter it was to yield.

First: Their likeness in the smallness of the germ from which they spring. The mustard seed is one of the smallest of the seeds that are sown by men; and were one to reason from it to the nature of its stalk, he might naturally infer that so slight a seminal particle could only shoot up a low and slender plant. Were the stem and branches only proportional to the seed, it would be one of the smallest of the herbs which men cultivate.

So the kingdom of heaven—that is the body of believers in Christ and subjects of his rule as the king of the ransomed, was at its institution immediately before his ascension, the slightest of all the societies of men that have a prince at their head, whose office it is to rule men. It was far less proportionably in that sphere, than the mustard seed was in the sphere of culinary seeds. At the first meeting of Christ with his disciples after his resurrection, there appear to have been but eleven. They, however, were but a part of the company of believers. The assembly also, soon after his ascension, in which there were a hundred and twenty, comprised but a part of those who had then embraced the faith, as Paul states that on an occasion previous to his ascension, he was seen "of above five hundred brethren at once."



But this, even after the accession that took place at the day of Pentecost, considered as the germ of a kingdom, was immeasurably less than any other kingly organization at its commencement, that ever rose to power. No other great personage, ever, at the assumption of his throne, had so slight a train of followers as Jesus, the prince of the children of the kingdom of heaven on the earth. His subjects, compared to those of the kings of the earth, and especially of the monarch of the Roman empire at that epoch, was proportionately far less in size than the mustard seed is among the seeds which men cultivate in their gardens and fields. Who, looking at the small number of his followers, their humble rank, and their destitution of the qualities that are usually requisite to attract the respect and favor of men, would have deemed it probable that they would ever become a great and commanding body?

Secondly: The likeness of the size and strength to which they attain. The mustard seed, notwithstanding its smallness, and the slowness apparently of the vital energy which it contains, shoots up a tall and vigorous stem, and sends out on every side branches so large that it resembles a tree. In like manner the kingdom of heaven, the body of believers in Christ, though so small, and seemingly uninfluential at first, in the lapse of a few years became a very numerous community in Jerusalem and Judea, and soon began to send out branches into the neighboring kingdoms; first into Syria, Egypt, Arabia; then into Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy; at length into western Europe and Eastern Asia; and in modern times to this continent and the isles of the Pacific and Indian Oceans. Notwithstanding the vast number of the children of the wicked one who were almost immediately intermixed with the true subjects of the kingdom of heaven, that kingdom rose to great strength even in its first age; and though often depressed and hid in a measure in seclusion, it has through a considerable part of its career been widespread and powerful. Were all who now belong to it collected from the different nations into one scene, though but a small portion of those embraced in the nominal church, they would constitute a great host.

Thirdly: The analogy of the support and shelter which the mustard plant yields to the birds of the air, to that which

the kingdom of the saints yields to the sons and daughters of men who take shelter beneath it. The mustard plant rose to such a height, and shot out boughs of such size, that to the birds of the air it took the rank of a tree, and they set up their tents—that is their nests—on it, and reared their young in its shade. In like manner the kingdom of Christ's followers soon rose to such size, strength, and conspicuity, that many of the sons and daughters of men who did not belong to it took shelter beneath it, as it were, or chose its shadow as their residence for the rearing of their young. It has been the chief scene of religious education; the great nursery to the offspring of parents not themselves members of the kingdom, that have been trained to a knowledge of Christ through every age since its first institution. Such were vast crowds of the catechumens of the early centuries. Such are great numbers of those who are now receiving instruction in Sunday schools and other Christian seminaries; and this, whether we limit the view to those only who are taught by the nominal church, because the children of the kingdom are embraced within it, or to those only who are in reality the children of that kingdom. There are millions of parents at this moment who do not belong to the church, who nevertheless look to the disciples of Christ in the sacred office and in other stations to give their children Christian instruction, imbue them with virtuous principles, and form them to dignity and happiness. No other body of teachers has ever educated so vast a number of the young, belonging to classes that differed from themselves. All others put together have not. In this relation the mustard seed has not only become a tree, but a tree towering to the loftiest height, and casting the broadest shadow. No other has ever attracted so many of the fowls of heaven to its shade, or been the scene where so many of their young were reared.

1. How unlike is God's all-comprehensive wisdom to the narrow views of men! Had it been left to the disciples and their contemporaries to decide what course should be pursued in the institution of the kingdom of heaven, they would doubtless have caused it to triumph immediately over all its enemies, and filled the whole earth with its glory. But God institutes it in feebleness; leaves it to struggle with

powerful and relentless foes through a long lapse of ages, and often permits them to trample it down and overwhelm it with insult, oppression, and slaughter. How manifest it is that there must be ends of infinite moment to be answered by this great measure! Who can doubt that they lie in the preparation that is wrought by this vast experiment of the human heart, for the far differing administration that is to be instituted at the close of this age, when instead of such a contest with Satan, and such a mixed state of the church, all nations are to be converted, and the world filled with righteousness and bliss?

2. Notwithstanding the feebleness of Christ's kingdom hitherto, vast crowds of the young have been drawn beneath its shadow to receive their religious education, and have been trained under its teachings, prayers, and examples, to become at length its children, and share in its eternal joys and glories. Myriads and millions who have first been nurtured by, and then incorporated in it during its age of conflicts and trials, will hereafter shine in it as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars for ever and ever.

#### V. THE LEAVEN.

Matt. xiii. 33. Luke xiii. 20, 21.

"He spoke another parable to them. The kingdom of heaven is like leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal until the whole was leavened."

"And again he said. To what shall I liken the kingdom of God? It is like leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened."

This parable illustrates the kingdom of God in a different relation from the last. That showed, though small at its institution, it was to rise to greatness and strength, without indicating that it was at length to become commensurate with the earth. This shows that when it reaches its consummation, it is to embrace all nations. Three measures of meal were, according to Jerome, somewhat more than a bushel. It was a large mass, therefore, to be fermented by a slight infusion of leaven. The population of the earth

seemed equally disproportioned to the kingdom of heaven at its establishment. Yet it is in due time to extend its sway over them all. And this is all that the parable exemplifies.

There is no analogy, as many writers have imagined, between the principle on which leaven acts in fermenting a mass of dough, and the process by which the kingdom of God extends its sway over men. They are entirely dissimilar. Dough is not an antagonistic mass which has to be conquered and changed in nature in order to its assimilating with leaven. Instead, their union is the result of an affinity between them, and the susceptibility of the dough is as efficient a power in their assimilation, as the communicative force is of the leaven. The diffusion of the leaven throughout the mass, and the fermentation it occasions, are chemical processes, in which the dough has by virtue of its relative nature as active a share, as the leaven has by virtue of its differing nature.

There is no such affinity between unsanctified men and the kingdom of heaven. Instead, mankind are hostile to Christ and his sway, and the natural language of their hearts is—We will not have this king to reign over us. They are reduced to subjection, accordingly, by conquest; by a force that subdues and transforms them. The power by which they are brought to a union to Christ, and constituted children of the kingdom, lies out of themselves, and is employed in imbuing them with a new inclination.

Nor does the kingdom of heaven present any likeness to the leaven in the rapidity with which it extends itself. Leaven diffuses itself immediately through the mass into which it is introduced. It acts on the remotest particles almost as quickly as on those with which it first comes in contact. And as there are no counteractive forces with which it has to contend, and no obstacles it has to overcome, it soon accomplishes its office. In these respects the kingdom of heaven presents no resemblance to it whatever. In place of rapid and uninterrupted progress, Christ's empire advances only by a perpetual struggle with hostile and obstructing powers, by which it is not only checked and sometimes driven back into narrower limits, but at periods threatened with extinction. It is by a ceaseless conflict that it maintains itself in existence. After extending through

the Roman empire, it for ages gained no fresh territory; and again for two centuries and a half after the Reformation its movement was retrograde, rather than forward. Nor is it hereafter to receive any large accession till the Saviour comes and assumes its sceptre.

The leaven is not employed, as some have supposed, to exemplify the spread of the gospel. It is not the gospel that is compared to the leaven, but the kingdom of God. Nor does the gospel present any resemblance to the leaven, in the principle on which it acts, or the rapidity with which it works its effects. It does not achieve its effect by virtue of its own power; it does not assimilate naturally with the human heart. Instead, they are repellent of each other, and the word becomes efficacious only by the power of the Holy Spirit, who uses it as his instrument. Nor does the gospel continually spread itself and enlarge its domain. It has no empire, indeed, throughout a large part of the territory of nominal Christendom. It is rejected almost absolutely by whole nations that bear the Christian name, and is silenced and suppressed by the most numerous branches of the church.

Nor is the leaven used, as some have supposed, to illustrate the growth of piety in the heart. It is the kingdom of God, not the piety of the children of the kingdom, which the parable exemplifies. Nor does the advancement of those who are renewed in knowledge and sanctification, present any close resemblance to the rapid and uniform diffusion of leaven through the mass of dough with which it is intermixed. Instead, it is slow, obstructed by a thousand obstacles, and at best extremely imperfect. It is not until they are removed from this scene of trial, and raised to his immediate presence, that they become holy and unblamable before him in love.

Neither, finally, is it the growth of the church which the parable represents. The nominal church, instead of the mere kingdom, is the seat of the tares as well as the wheat. It embraces within its domains a vast array of apostate usurping and persecuting priests whom the Spirit of truth has denominated the Mystery of Iniquity, and the countless train of their vassals. But the kingdom of God consists only of those who are renewed by the Holy Spirit, and ac-

knowledge and serve Christ as their head. Nor does the growth of the church present any likeness to the rapid and uniform diffusion of leaven. After a struggle of eighteen centuries, Christianity has not become even nominally the faith of more than about one-fourth of the population of the globe. Throughout the wide scene of its early triumphs in Asia and Northern Africa, it has become nearly extinct, and several of the nations of Europe that still profess it, are wasting away with senility and decrepitude; while for ages it has made few conquests in other parts of the world.

In contradistinction from all these, it is the kingdom of God which the parable illustrates, and the sole points of resemblance between it and the leaven fermenting the whole of the three measures of meal, is in the universality of the sway which it is at length to attain over the nations of the earth. As the leaven, though but slight at its introduction into the three measures, spread its influence through the whole mass, leaving not a particle that was not leavened—so the kingdom of God, though small at its institution, is to extend itself throughout the whole earth, and all tribes and all individuals are to become its children.

As it is shown in the parable of the tares that the apostate and hostile party is to continue intermixed with the children of the kingdom till the end of the present age, it is apparent that the conversion of all nations here foretold, is not to take place till after Christ's second coming.

---

ART. V.—A DESIGNATION AND EXPOSITION OF THE  
FIGURES OF ISAIAH, CHAPTER XXIX.

THIS prophecy announces first, a siege of Jerusalem and reduction of its inhabitants to extreme weakness and distress; and then, the instant dispersion of their enemies by the interposition of the Almighty; and next it foreshows the great blindness and wickedness to which the Israelites were to be left of God, notwithstanding the teachings of his word; pronounces a woe on them; and finally predicts the knowledge,

faith, and love to which they are to be raised at the time of their redemption and re-adoption as his people.

"Woe to Ariel, Ariel the city where David dwelt," v. 1. Ariel, it is universally held by interpreters, is used as a descriptive name of Jerusalem. Some regard it as denoting *lion of God*, to indicate the courage of its population; but others, more probably as meaning the *fire-place* or *altar of God* on which his justice was displayed in burning the victims offered to him,—a sense in which it is applied to the altar, Ezek. xliii. 15. If this is the meaning with which the term is used, it is presented in this intimate and sacred relation to God, to indicate more strongly the awfulness of the woe that is denounced on it. In harmony with this it is next declared directly to be the city where David dwelt, or established his camp, not only to identify it as Jerusalem, but to contrast the power and glory with which it had been distinguished; with the helplessness and dishonor to which it was about to be reduced.

1. Apostrophe to the inhabitants of the city. "Add ye year to year; let the feasts go round [in their course]," v. 1.

2. Comparison: "Yet I will distress Ariel, and there shall be sadness and sorrow; and it shall be to me as the altar hearth," v. 2. The continued observance by its inhabitants of the forms of worship was not to shield it from the divine vengeance. Though they should celebrate the feasts at their regular periods through a long succession of years, yet at length the city should be reduced by God to the most urgent straits, and its festivals, instead of seasons of gladness and exultation, should be seasons of sorrow and dismay. The city should be to God like the hearth of the great altar, a theatre for the display of his vengeance; or a place in which his justice should overwhelm and devour its guilty inhabitants, as the fire devoured the victims that were offered on the altar at the temple; a comparison of awful strength and significance.

3, 4, 5. Hypocatastases. "And I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a mount, and will raise against thee ramparts," v. 3. Those acts of God are used as substitutes for measures of his providence by which the enemies of Jerusalem will be led to encamp

against her, erect ramparts for her demolition, and employ the usual and most efficacious means of assault for her conquest. In the age of the prophet, the principal method of capturing a fortified town was, first the extension of a camp around it so as to preclude, on the one hand, the introduction from without of fresh troops and provisions, and on the other, the escape from within of the population and troops; next the erection of mounds from which arrows, javelins, and other projectiles, might be hurled against the besieged on the walls, and over the walls into the city; and finally the construction of engines with battering rams, that might be driven forward so as to assail and beat down the walls. If the events foreshown are, as the prophecy indicates, still future, these ancient methods are employed by hypocatastases for the more effective means of modern warfare.

6, 7. An apostrophe to Ariel as though it had been declared by a metaphor to be an individual, v. 3, 4.

8, 9, 10, 11, 12. Hypocatastases. "And thou shalt be brought down; out of the ground shalt thou speak; and thy speech shall be low out of the dust; and thy voice shall be like a necromancer, out of the ground; and out of the dust shall thy speech whisper," v. 4. These several states and acts of an individual helplessly prostrate and in the last stage of terror and exhaustion, are used by substitution for the resembling prostration and hopelessness to which the inhabitants of Jerusalem are to be reduced by their enemies. What other pencil ever drew so vivid a picture of the humiliation, the helplessness, the expiring gasp, as it were, of a vanquished people! They are divested of all power of defending themselves; they have fallen to the ground; they have sunk so far into the arms of death, that their voices are stifled; they can only utter the horror with which they are overwhelmed in faint and inarticulate whispers! Yet though thus in the last agonies of dissolution, they are to be delivered.

13. Comparison of the voice of the people in their prostration and despair, to the voice of a necromancer out of the ground; that is, in unnatural tones, indicative of an overpowering awe or terror, and adapted to excite it. That necromancers were accustomed to announce their feigned messages from the dead in an artificial voice, as though it



emerged from the ground, and in inarticulate whispers and mutterings, is shown Isaiah viii. 19, and is well known from heathen writers. They used the art of the ventriloquist often, not only to deceive, but to excite the wonder and awe of their hearers.

14, 15. Comparisons: "But the multitude of thy strangers [enemies] shall be like fine dust, and like passing chaff, the multitude of the terrible ones: and it shall be suddenly in a moment," v. 5. This image is more indicative of mental helplessness, than that which is employed to paint the condition of the Israelites. Their enemies are in an instant, without any forewarning, to be divested of their power, and become like the unconscious dust and weightless chaff, which the slightest breeze, the faintest breath, raises from the ground and drifts away where no one can trace it. What a change from the haughty self-confidence, the resistless might, the exulting triumph of conquerors! And a change that is to spring—not from any sudden diminution of their numbers, or unexpected resuscitation of their fallen foes; but from a cause from which their multitude can yield them no protection.

16. Hypocatastases in the use of visiting for an interposition for punishment. "There shall be a visitation from the presence of Jehovah of hosts, with thunder and earthquake, and great noise, and tempest and storm, and flame of devouring fire," v. 6. It is to be by a visible interposition of the Almighty therefore, with an earthquake, volcanic eruptions, tempests, and flaming fire, such as are to attend Christ's second coming, and the destruction of the hosts that are to be assembled against him in Judea, as foreshown Isaiah lxvi. 15, 16; Zech. xiv. 1-15; 2 Pet. iii. 3-13; 2 Thess. i. 6-9, and many other passages.

17. Comparison: "Then shall be as a dream, a vision of the night, the multitude of all the nations fighting against Ariel, even all that fight against her and her munition, and distress her," v. 7. It is to the inhabitants of Jerusalem that the besieging hosts are thus to become like a dream; that is, like persons and scenes beheld in a dream, that vanish from their imaginary existence on the dreamer's awaking. The comparison indicates, therefore, that the hostile armies are to be instantly swept from life by the whirl-

wind of divine vengeance, so that they will cease to be enemies and objects of dread, as completely as the spectres of a night vision vanish from being and cease to be objects of fear, when the dreamer, whose fancy they for a moment have peopled, awakes.

18, 19. Comparisons: "And it shall be as when a hungry man dreams, and lo he eats; but he awakes and his soul is empty: and as when a thirsty man dreams, and lo he drinks; but he awakes, and lo he is faint and his soul craving; so shall it be with the multitude of all the nations that fight against Mount Zion," v. 8. These comparisons exemplify the disappointment of the besiegers at their defeat. They are to be inflamed with eager desires of conquering the city and glutting their passions on its helpless inhabitants; and are in a measure, it would seem from Zechariah xiv. 2, to succeed; but in the moment of seeming victory and anticipated rapine, they are to be arrested by the tempest of divine justice, and find the prey vanished from their grasp, like the viands of which a hungry dreamer imagines he is partaking, but which, on awaking, prove to have had no real existence, and have contributed nothing towards slaking his appetite. This implies that they are to indulge the most unhesitating assurance of success in their assault on the city, till the thunderbolt of the Almighty strikes them to the realms of death.

This prediction has been supposed by some to have had its accomplishment in the destruction of the army of Sennacherib; others have referred it to the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar or Titus. There was no such interposition, however, of the Almighty in either of those sieges as is here foreshown; and no such destruction of the besieging hosts by convulsions of the earth, the explosion of subterranean fires, the suffusion of the air with burning elements, and the furious blasts and thunder tempests that are generated by such volcanic eruptions. The event is undoubtedly still future; and is the destruction of the antichristian hosts, that after the return of a portion of the Israelites to Palestine, are to attempt to reconquer and disperse them, and thereby prevent the establishment there of Christ's kingdom; but at the moment of seeming victory are to be arrested by Christ, who is to appear visibly with his mighty

angels and "rain on them and their bands, and the many people that are with them, an overflowing rain and great hailstones, fire, and brimstone," Ezekiel xxxviii. 22. Others suppose Ariel is here used as a representative of the ancient Israelitish church, and that its siege and threatened destruction denote an analogous war on that church, and reduction of it to the verge of annihilation; and that the sudden deliverance of the city by the divine interposition, represents the institution of the church in a new form, and introduction of Gentiles into it under the ministry of the apostles. But this is wholly groundless, inconsistent with the laws of language, and would involve the prophecy in inextricable embarrassment. Those interpreters found this construction on the assumption that the passage is metaphorical. But as we have seen, there is no metaphor in it, except an elliptical one, by which the city is addressed as though it were an individual. The only other figures in it, are hypocatastases, apostrophes, and comparisons. Neither the city nor its population have any adaptation to represent the ancient church considered as a body of true worshippers. The Israelitish church embraced the whole nation, unrenewed as well as sanctified. The people of Jerusalem, consisting as they doubtless did, in as large a proportion as the nation, of unsanctified persons, were no more a fit representative of those who were sanctified, than the nation at large, and cannot, from their dissimilarity, were there a figure that admitted it, have been used in that relation. Besides, if the people of Jerusalem are used as representatives of the true worshippers of the Israelitish church, the Gentile hosts must, on the same principle, be used as symbols of the true worshippers of the Gentile church. But is that possible? Can any one persuade himself that those ambitious, cruel, and bloody hosts, bent on slaughter and rapine, and engaged in open war on God, are representatives of the pure worshippers of the Gentile church; the servants of God who bear his name on their foreheads; the witnesses and martyrs of Jesus? Besides, how can they make war on the ancient Israelitish church, or body of pure worshippers, when that church no longer exists in this world? Or if the prediction is supposed to have received its accomplishment, when was it that the true followers and witnesses of Christ

in the Gentile church, made an onset analogous to the predicted siege of Jerusalem, on the body of ancient Israelitish worshippers, and threatened them with such a destruction? There has been no ancient Israelitish church since the institution of Christianity; and no Israelitish church in contradistinction from the Gentiles, since the overthrow of Jerusalem by Titus, the termination of the ritual worship there, and the exile of the nation from their land. The supposition that Ariel, or its population, is a representative of the Israelitish church, or the church in any relation, is thus wholly inadmissible. Neither has any adaptation to all such an office; it is wholly forbidden by the language; and it would convert the prediction into a complication of incongruities and contradictions. The passage is as specific and clear a prophecy of the literal siege of Jerusalem, and by hostile nations, and their sudden destruction by the interposition of Jehovah, as words can utter; and all the figures that occur in it contribute to give a living form and vivid coloring to that meaning.

The prophet now proceeds to predict that, notwithstanding this vision and all the other revelations God had made to them, they would prove utterly unbelieving and perverse, and continue so till he interposes for their redemption; when they are to be universally converted, and become a wise, a holy, and a happy people.

20. Apostrophe. "Stop ye, and be stupified; be bewildered and blinded!" v. 9. This is addressed to the Israelites, and indicates that instead of exhibiting the intelligence, filial trust, and obedience becoming God's people, they were to sink into a sottish stupor, and act like persons who have lost their senses.

21, 22. Hypocatastases. "They are drunk, but not with wine; they reel, but not with strong drink," v. 9. The intoxication ascribed to them is not of the body, but drunkenness and reeling are used by substitution for the analogous perversion and bewilderment of the mind in sin. An awful picture truly! They are exhibited, not simply as in great errors; not merely as greatly offending God; but as sunk to such a depth of blindness and sottishness that, like persons bewildered and staggering with intoxication, they were utterly beyond the reach of warning and remonstrance.

23, 24, 25. Hypocatastases. "For Jehovah has poured out upon you a spirit of deep sleep, and has shut your eyes: the prophets and your rulers or chiefs the seers, he has blindfolded," v. 10. These acts are put by substitution for analogous measures of providence, by which God allowed them to sink into insensibility, and misconceive and misrepresent his purposes and teachings. They were to become the victims of as absolute a delusion and bewilderment, under the sway of their unbelief and alienation, as though a spirit or power inducing a deep sleep were poured on them, and their eyes were closed so as to preclude the perception of external objects. A bandage was to be put also on the eyes of their prophets and leaders, whose very office it was both to see visions and interpret the divine will, by which they were to be precluded from seeing. By their prophets and leaders the seers, are probably meant merely those official teachers whose business it was to interpret the revelations God had made, and instruct them in respect to his purposes. A fillet was to be bound over their eyes that should intercept their sight, and make them as incapable of deciphering the sacred page, as the people themselves, lost in a profound slumber, were. This is illustrated by a similitude, in which both the learned and unlearned are exhibited as equally incapable of discerning the meaning of God's word.

26. Comparison. "And the vision of all—or all vision—is become to you like the words of a sealed book which they give to one knowing letters, saying, Pray, read this; and he says, I cannot, for it is sealed. And the book is given to one who knows not letters, saying, Pray, read this; and he says, I know not letters," v. 11, 12. By the vision of all, or the whole vision, is meant every vision, the whole revelation God has made through the prophets. The blindness and bewilderment of the teachers and taught were thus to be such, that the meaning of the predictions made through the ancient prophets would be as completely lost to the learned as to the ignorant. To the one, they would be like a book that being sealed cannot be read; and to the other, like a book that, being written in an unknown character, is wholly unintelligible.

This prediction has had a very exact and conspicuous fulfilment through a long series of ages. Dark as the picture

is, the unbelief, blindness, and infatuation of the Israelites of all ranks, for more than eighteen centuries, have been precisely such as are here foreshown of them. Their pride, their prejudice, and their delusion, have been such that they have been unable to see the divinity of the Christian dispensation, though foreshown in their prophets as the substance of which the Mosaic institutions were the type; and their expositors and teachers have been as blind and intractable as the unlearned multitude. This hiding of the truth from their eyes is foretold also in the New Testament; and its period is defined as to extend till the time of their final redemption at the second coming of Christ. "Blindness in part is happened unto Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so shall all Israel be saved; as it is written, And the Deliverer shall come to Zion, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob."—Rom. xi 26.

Notwithstanding, however, the utter ignorance and darkness in which they are to be involved, they are still to keep up a show of obedience to God. "And the Lord said, Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips they honor me, but their heart have they put far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men: Therefore, behold I will continue to act wonderfully with this people, very wonderfully; and the wisdom of their wise ones shall perish, and the prudence of their prudent ones shall disappear," v. 13, 14. As they were to substitute a mere formal and hypocritical religion founded on the authority of men, for that which he had enjoined, he would conduct his providence over them in such a manner as to confound their devices, and cause their boasted wisdom to perish. And what a signal verification has this prediction received? The worship of the Israelites for a long series of centuries has been little else than a mere chatter of empty words; their doctrinal system is in a great measure the invention of the rabbis, and depends for its support on their authority; and the disappointment for eighteen hundred years of their expectation of a Messiah, who should be a mere worldly prince, and make it his chief business to raise them from their political degradation, and give them dominion over other nations, has confuted their

claims to supernatural knowledge, and caused their reputation for wisdom to perish.

27, 28. Hypocatastases. "Woe unto them that go deep to hide their counsel from Jehovah, and their works are in the dark; and they say, Who sees us, and who knows us?" v. 15. Going deep as into the earth, and working in the dark, which are means by which evil-doers avoid the observation of those against whom they are plotting, are put by substitution for analogous measures to elude the notice of God.

29. Apostrophe. [Such is] "your perversion! Is the potter to be reckoned as the clay;—that the thing made should say of its maker, he did not make me; and the thing formed say of its former, he does not understand?" v. 16. This treatment of Jehovah, as though his attributes were finite, like those of creatures, and men might by artifice hide their crimes from his knowledge, indicates a loss of all proper conceptions of him, and a most besotted degradation of the intellect, and perversion of the heart. Among those on whom the woe is denounced, are doubtless the Jewish priests and teachers of the last ten or fifteen centuries, and especially of the present age, who seem to have imagined that by violently misinterpreting the ancient prophecies respecting the Messiah, and forcing on them a meaning compatible with the denial that they had their fulfilment in Jesus Christ, they convert it into a fact that Jesus is not the Messiah, and thereby treat God as though he were not the author of his own works, nor determiner of his own purposes: a perverseness and folly immeasurably greater than that which a vessel of clay would display, should it deny both that the potter who formed it, wrought it, and that he had the requisite knowledge for the task. This impeachment of his perfections, and denial of his dominion, God will surely avenge. Vain will be their hope of hiding themselves from his eye, or escaping his hand. "Though they dig into hell," he has forewarned them, "thence shall mine hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down; and though they hide themselves in the top of Carmel, I will search and take them out thence; and though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence

will I command the serpent, and he shall bite them; and though they go into captivity before their enemies, thence will I command the sword, and it shall slay them; and I will set my eyes upon them for evil, and not for good."—Amos ix. 2-4. Their infidelity, their hypocrisy, their artifices, have not shielded them from this terrible denunciation. It has pursued them wherever they have wandered or been driven, and verified itself on every generation through a long series of ages, and will continue to be verified till the hour at length of their conversion arrives.

The prophet now announces the interposition of Jehovah to redeem them from their blindness, and change them from aliens to loving and trusting children; and from exile and sorrow, to re-establishment in their ancient land in joy and peace.

"Is it not yet a very little while, and Lebanon shall be turned to a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be esteemed a forest?" v. 17. The date from which the little time is to be reckoned, that is to precede the extraordinary change here foretold, is doubtless the period of the last woe that is to be inflicted on the Israelites for their perverseness; and is the period therefore of their commencing return to their national country and attempt to re-establish themselves there, when they are to be driven to the edge of destruction by their enemies, as predicted in v. 1-9. It is probable, therefore, that their blindness and madness in misrepresenting the truth will reach their climax at that period. Some expositors regard this verse as metaphorical, and denoting a moral change of the people in place of a physical change of Lebanon and the neighboring plains. There is, however, no metaphor in it. A change of Lebanon to fruitful fields, and of fruitful fields to forests, by a depression of the one and elevation of the other, or by other processes, is not incompatible with their nature, but is as easy to the Most High as to sustain them in their present state. Nor is the change of the mountain and fruitful field used by hypocatastasis to represent an analogous change of the people. That would imply that the best, the sanctified part of the nation, were to be changed to apostasy, or at least were to decline in obedience; as the change of a fertile and fruit-bearing field to a forest, would be a change from beauty and usefulness to wild-



ness and unproductiveness, and is the image of a curse instead of a blessing. That the change of the mountain and field is not used as representative of the reformation of the people foreshown in the verses that follow, is made clear also by the prediction that the latter is to be contemporaneous with the former. That specification of the time when they are to be redeemed from their blindness, would be unnecessary and unnatural if it were identically the same event as the change of Lebanon to a fruitful field, and of a fruitful field to a forest, denotes. The revolution foreshown in the passage is doubtless therefore a literal change in Lebanon, or parts of that mountain, and portions of the cultivated region of Palestine; such as is indicated in Isaiah ii. 2, 18-21; xxiv. 6-14; Zech. xiv. 4-6, and other passages; and is to be among the changes by which the earth and atmosphere are to be renovated and fitted more adequately than they now are for the residence of the renewed inhabitants and the glorified saints—and it is predicted here in this interrogative form, to show the absolute power of the Most High over everything that concerns the Israelites, to indicate the contrast which his purposes form to their unbelieving and senseless schemes, and to rebuke thereby their folly and impiety in thinking to conceal themselves from his notice, and circumvent him by artifice and hypocrisy.

30, 31. Hypocastases. "And in that day shall the deaf hear the words of the book; and out of obscurity and darkness shall the eyes of the blind see. And the humble shall increase in joy in Jehovah, and the poor among men shall rejoice in the Holy One of Israel," v. 18, 19. As deep sleep and a bandaging of the eyes were used, v. 10, as representatives of their senselessness and inability to see; so the opening of the ears of the deaf and of the eyes of the blind, are here employed by substitution for analogous changes in the minds of the Israelites. They are to be recalled from their alienation from God, and imbued with a disposition to receive his word, which they have so long disbelieved and perverted. They are to be raised out of the abyss of moral darkness in which they are now groping, into the light of heaven, and meet in wonder, adoration, and joy the smile of their Redeemer whom they have for so many ages rejected. And his favor is not to be confined to the great and wealthy. Instead, the

humble and poor are especially to share the blessings of his reign, and because the tyrannical and malevolent who have made them their victims, are never more to molest them.

32, 33, 34. Hypocatastases: "For the violent ceaseth, and the scoffer is no more, and all that watch for iniquity are cut off; that treat a man as an offender for a word, and lay a snare for him that pleads in the gate, and overthrow the righteous by deceit," v. 20, 21. The watchers for iniquity are those who continually seek opportunities to perpetrate injustice, as a beast of prey watches for the victims on which it feeds. Cutting them off, as a bough is severed from a tree, or a limb from the body, is used by substitution for destroying them, or consigning them to death. The gate was the place where the princes and judges sat for the discharge of their public duties, and tried the causes of the people. To lay a snare, as a pitfall or noose, for him that pleads in the gate, is used by substitution for an attempt by artifice to betray him into some mistaken admission, contradictory statement, or other error in his plea, by which they might gain such power over him as to defraud him of his rights. To overthrow the righteous, that is, cast him to the ground, is used by the same figure, to represent their defeating him in his cause. The unjust and cruel rulers, who have perpetrated these forms of injustice towards the humble, the unoffending, the poor, and the upright, are no more to be known to the Israelites after their conversion and reinstatement in their ancient land.

35. Metonymy of the house for the family of Jacob: "Therefore thus saith Jehovah to the house of Jacob, he who redeemed Abraham, Jacob shall not now be ashamed; and his face shall not now become pale. But when he sees his children, the work of my hands, in the midst of him, they shall sanctify my name, and shall sanctify the Holy One of Jacob, and they shall fear the God of Israel," v. 22, 23.

36. Hypocatastasis, in the use of erring, which is to wander from the right path, for embracing false views of God: "Then shall the erring in spirit know wisdom, and the murmurers shall receive instruction," v. 24. That the exemption of Jacob from both blushing and fainting is to take place when he sees his children in the midst of him, indi-

cates that it is to be after the restoration of the nation to their land. Then they are to be universally converted to God. Those who have wandered the furthest from him are to be brought to a knowledge and acknowledgment of him; and those who have assailed and misrepresented his dealings with them, are to be made to see his righteousness and wisdom, and adore and glorify him.

The chapter is thus a clear and graphic prediction of the blindness to which the Israelites were to be abandoned during their long exile from their native land; the straits to which they are to be reduced by their enemies, after a portion of them have returned to Jerusalem and established themselves there; the visible interposition of the Almighty to destroy the hosts that besiege them; and finally, their deliverance from oppression thereafter, their universal conversion, and the eminent knowledge and happiness to which they are to be exalted, after their general restoration to their ancient land; events—except their obduracy and blindness—that are yet to be accomplished.

---

#### ART. VI.—THE PRIMITIVE PURITANS.

BY THE REV. JOHN FORSYTH, JUN., D.D.

At the period when, by the triumph of Constantine, the relations of Paganism and of Christianity to the state were so completely and suddenly reversed, the internal condition of the Catholic church in some respects was not unlike that of the church of England after the accession of Elizabeth. Until within half a century of the age of Constantine, the church had exhibited the aspect of a widely ramified but compact body, having a common faith and a common life. During the whole course of her history, heretics had arisen, often from among her own sons, and had vented systems presenting a compound more or less monstrous of paganism, philosophy, and the gospel; but there was a broad and visible line of demarcation separating all these heretical sects

from that great and growing society known as the church of Christ. Even a Pagan, if intelligent and candid, could not fail to discern it, and was in little danger of mistaking the Gnostic or the Manichean for the Christian.

But about the middle of the third century, the visible unity of the church was disturbed by the conflicts of parties, who, though maintaining with equal tenacity her ancient faith, and observing the same forms of worship, were to such a degree antagonistic as to refuse communion with each other, in the public offices of religion. These schisms had their origin in disputes concerning discipline rather than doctrine, yet they engendered a zeal so intense that not even the most furious tempest of persecution against the Christian name and faith was able to extinguish it. During all the storms which swept over the church, from the days of Decius to those of Diocletian, these divisions subsisted in undiminished vigor. Accordingly, at the memorable epoch when Constantine admitted the long suffering church as a welcome and honored guest into the palace of the Cæsars, we find large bodies of Christians, in various parts of the empire, who then were, and for sixty years had been, in a state of separation from the larger community. They were known by names derived from the localities in which they lived, or from the persons who were the chief instruments in effecting the schism, while they also bore in common the appellation of Cathari, i.e. *Puritists* or *Puritans*. Of the founders of this primitive puritanism, few authentic memorials survive; their own writings, and especially those which grew out of their personal controversies, have for the most part perished, so that we are now mainly dependent upon the one-sided accounts of their enemies for our information respecting them. Hence, in order to form a fair and candid judgment in regard to the character of these men, and the influence they exerted upon their times, it is obviously necessary to sift carefully the statements of their prejudiced and often embittered opponents, and to draw upon our knowledge of human nature, which will sometimes go a good way in supplying the lack of historical materials. That these early schismatics, as they are commonly styled, were exempt from personal frailties, or from the current errors of their day, is not to be supposed, but at the same

time we have a strong persuasion that they have not received full justice at the hands of our principal historians, and that they do not hold the place in the memory of the church, which they really deserve, for their services in stemming the incoming tide of corruption, and as faithful witnesses for the truth of Christ.

The history of the rise and progress of the earliest Puritan schism, as *commonly* given, is substantially as follows: It originated at Carthage, during the Decian persecution, and while Cyprian was pastor of the church in that city. By the advice of his friends, Cyprian was induced to seek a shelter from the fury of the storm, at a distance from Carthage. His absence from his flock afforded a fine opportunity to those who were envious of the influence which Cyprian's eloquence, energy, and piety enabled him to wield, to carry out their ambitious schemes. It was greedily seized by Novatus, a presbyter, and Felicissimus, a deacon, of the church of Carthage. These men, though guilty of the most infamous crimes, contrived to gather round themselves a party decidedly hostile to Cyprian, and in the end to establish a distinct congregation having a bishop of its own. This body of Carthaginian separatists was, however, soon merged in another secession, which took place at Rome, and is known as

*The Novatian Schism.* It too had its origin in the personal ambition of the man who gave name to it. During the Decian persecution, Fabian, the venerable pastor of the Roman church, had been called to seal his testimony with his blood. For more than a year the pastorate remained vacant; partly on account of the fury of the tempest beating against the followers of Jesus, and partly from the want of harmony in the church. The two prominent candidates for the vacant office were the presbyters Cornelius and Novatian.\* The latter had won for himself a high reputation for his abilities, learning, eloquence, the strictness of his principles, and his unblemished life. Cornelius, however, was chosen by a small majority. Novatian, disappointed and disgusted with the result, at once took steps to form a

---

\* It is proper to observe that Novatus of Carthage must not be confounded with Novatian at Rome.

new communion of which he should be head; he denounced his rival Cornelius in the bitterest terms for his laxity in readmitting to the fellowship of the church, the Lapsed, or those who had in the time of persecution denied the faith; and finally, having brought to Rome three ignorant country bishops, and by plying them well with wine, having converted them into ready tools, he was by these inebriated prelates ordained to the episcopate. Such is the story of Novatus and Novatian as told by a large class of historians, Papal and Protestant, who have little else to say of them than that they were noted disturbers of the peace of the church. In a word, they somehow suddenly appear upon the surface of the stream of history, are seen there for a moment, and then disappear for ever, leaving not a trace behind.

Now this schism, so far from being as insignificant as some eminent writers seem to have regarded it, was really one of the most important events in the history of the early church. As we shall presently show, the movement was by no means limited to a few localities; on the contrary, it enlisted the warm sympathies of thousands of Christians in the east and the west; it subsisted for several centuries as a distinct organization under its original name, maintaining a vigorous life; and if it did not, strictly speaking, give birth to, it at least prepared the way for other secessions from the dominant church, the influence of which can be traced more or less distinctly down to the epoch of the Reformation.

Here then is a great historical fact. In the middle of the third century the church is suddenly rent. Thousands of her members withdraw from her fellowship, and form a separate communion, known as that of the Cathari or Puritans, which survives for centuries. What were the causes of this schism? What relation did they bear to the actual life of the church in that age—what light do they cast upon her internal condition, her faith, and her forms? These questions certainly come within the sphere of history, the history which, refusing to content itself with the comparatively humble function of recording the events of the past, seeks to discover their causes and their consequences, their earliest germ and their ripened fruits. It is by the prosecution of such inquiries, that history is enabled to give forth

her loftiest lessons, and to gather from the experience of the ages that are gone, principles of the highest practical value applicable to the present day and to future generations. Most of our older ecclesiastical authors, however, in discussing these and the like topics, have unfortunately yielded an implicit deference to the authority of the Fathers, to which they were no more entitled when asserting matters of fact, than when expounding matters of faith. They seem to have looked upon it as a sort of heresy, to question the veracity of such men as Cyprian, Eusebius, Optatus, and others, when speaking of the events of their own day. In short, the so called Catholic writers having got the ear of the church, told the story of the past in their own way, illustrating it with portraits of heretics and schismatics, which too many over-credulous Protestants received as truthful pictures of the originals, though the features of most of them are to the last degree repulsive.

In the present day, the student of history is not quite so ready to take things upon trust; he demands that the testimony of contemporary witnesses, however illustrious or obscure, be sifted and compared; that they be subjected to a rigid cross-examination, and that the documents of the remote past, so far as possible, be dealt with just as we deal with those of later times.\* Then, again, a much wider field is open to him from whence to gather illustrations of the tendencies of human nature sanctified and depraved. The history of the schisms of the last few centuries supplies him with important helps for the better understanding of the true character and results of those of the early church. Now the annals of schism clearly establish this position—that no man, however able, eloquent, and pious, can originate a sect having “life in itself,” on personal grounds alone. The personal contests which usually accompany, and give a certain complexion to such movements, may be the occasions, but in no proper sense are they the causes of them. For the work done by Luther, Zwingle, and their fellow reformers, by the

---

\* Mosheim, in his *De Rebus ante Const.*, evinces a good deal of the true spirit of historical research; yet even in this able work, it is curious to observe in many places the contest between this spirit and the deference for patristic authority derived from the old school in which he was educated. Jortin, by the way, deserves more consideration than he usually gets.

Erskines in Scotland, by the Wesleys in England, a solid basis had been already laid,—a basis which was the slow growth of years. An able and ambitious churchman may, without much difficulty, establish a party within any communion; a speculative theologian may enlist a multitude of zealous advocates of his peculiar opinions; but, if we mistake not, the voice of history emphatically declares that no man simply on personal grounds can found a sect, instinct with life and energy, and maintaining a vigorous organized existence for generations. Yet such a sect was the Novatian. It spread with marvellous rapidity, and it flourished for centuries. Reasoning from analogous facts we may safely conclude, that Novatus and Novatian could never have raised a social structure of such size and solidity, unless the materials for it had been prepared long before; in other words, that they were simply the instruments of calling out and giving organic shape to sentiments which already dwelt in thousands of Christian hearts.

Neander\* thinks that the schism at Carthage, A. D. 250, was the fruit of the struggle then going on between the old apostolic Presbyterianism and embryo Prelacy. Into this contest Cyprian threw himself with the utmost ardor. He was, says Hagenbach, "eine durchaus energische Natur, ein Kirchenfürst in vollen Sinn des Wortes." Cyprian belonged to the class of men who create commanding positions, and who can render any spot illustrious, by making it the centre of a world-wide influence, as Augustine made the little city of Hippo, and Calvin the little town of Geneva. Carthage was indeed already great—the ancient mistress of the sea, once the proud rival and almost the conqueror of Rome, and now the metropolis of North Africa. In such a position there was much to stimulate the ambition of the man and the bishop, and Cyprian certainly did more than any other Carthaginian pastor, before or after him, to make the name of the city famous in the annals of the church. That Cyprian was a man of sincere piety, none acquainted with his history can doubt; and his writings show that he had tolerably clear views of gospel truth. He freely expended his private for-

---

\* Mosheim De Rebus takes essentially the same view. Schroeck, iv. 301, deems it doubtful.



tune for the good of the church, and he terminated his somewhat chequered ministry by winning the crown of martyrdom. But he was an ambitious churchman, and endowed as he was with all those qualities which give dignity and influence to the leader of a party, a spotless character, a generous disregard of money, commanding eloquence, aptness for business, and untiring energy—it is not wonderful that, in the course of his comparatively short pastorate, he secured for himself a large measure of spiritual power. He was indisputably the great man of the African church in that age, and no one was more thoroughly sensible of that fact than Cyprian himself.

At this period there were two church edifices in Carthage; one of them was known as the Old (or in American phrase, the First church), of which Cyprian was the immediate pastor; the other had been built a short time before the date of the Schism, upon an eminence in the suburbs of the city, for the accommodation of the members resident in the country, hence called *Ecclesia in Monte*, or the Hill church, and was under the care of Novatus, one of the presbyters of Carthage. Usually these suburban chapels were not designed to be independent of the old mother church, but were rather outstations for the convenience of distant members, and hence were served by the presbyters in turn. Of this Hill church, however, Novatus was sole pastor, and as such, he seems to have felt that his right to exercise episcopal authority was as perfect as that of Cyprian. Accordingly, he ordained Felicissimus as deacon in the Hill church without consulting Cyprian, or in any way recognising his right to be consulted. Struggling as Cyprian then was to build up a prelatic form of government, and to concentrate in his own hands as bishop the powers of ordination and of discipline, the conduct of Novatus must have been exceedingly distasteful to him. This act was followed by another equally offensive on the part of the deacon, who appears to have been quite as determined as Novatus to uphold the independence of the Hill church. From the retreat to which Cyprian had gone to avoid the fury of persecution, he wrote an epistle to the deacons of Carthage in regard to the distribution of the poor's fund, expecting, of course, that his directions would be obeyed by the officers of both churches. The money be-

longing to the Hill church was in the hands of Felicissimus, who sturdily repelled Cyprian's claims to interfere with the matter, except in his own congregation, and would not suffer his messengers to touch a denarius. Such was the state of affairs when Cyprian returned; but Novatus having in the meanwhile removed to Rome, left his deacon to fight the battle of independence alone. A synod was summoned for the settlement of the case, in which Cyprian being all-powerful, the deacon and his friends were condemned, but refusing to bow to the decision, they seceded from the prevailing party and elected Fortunatus bishop of the new communion. These facts fully confirm the judgment of Neander, in regard to the connexion of this schism with the contest between old Presbyterianism and the new-born Prelacy.

Gibbon observes, that if Novatus and his friend the deacon "were not the most detestable monsters of wickedness, the *seal* of Cyprian must occasionally *have prevailed over his veracity.*" The former is described by him as "*rerum semper cupidus, rapacitate furibundus, arrogantia et stupore superbi tumoris inflatus—fax et ignis ad conflanda seditionis incendia, turbo et tempestas ad fidei facienda naufragia,*" with many other and more hateful qualities. Yet this picture is accepted by certain historians as faithful, because it is not to be supposed that so holy a man and martyr as Cyprian could lose his temper or utter a falsehood. Novatus certainly could not have become such a monster of depravity within a single year; if he was so bad a man, Cyprian must have been long aware of it; yet he utters not a word of censure until his prelate schemes and claims are resisted; nay, Cyprian's own epistles show that Novatus and he had lived up to this time on very good terms.

The portrait of Felicissimus, as drawn by the same hand, is no less dark than that of Novatus; he was addicted "*ad fraudes, rapinas, adulterium;*" he was "*pecuniæ commissæ sibi fraudator, stuprator virginum, matrimoniorum multorum depopulator et corruptor.*" But when he comes to trial before the Synod, Cyprian, either moved by an ill-judged charity, or because he found it easier to accuse of crime than to make good his charges, concludes to say nothing respecting the worst of them. "*Taceo de fraudibus,*" says he, "*adulteria prætereo;*" while the "*delictum*

maximum" of the deacon was his opposition to his mandates. In view of these and similar facts which might be adduced, every candid man will admit, that Jortin had ample reason for his statements in regard to the fathers of the third, fourth, and succeeding centuries, viz. that their accounts even of the heretics of their own age must be received with a large allowance for ignorance, credulity, and prejudice, while in the case of their personal antagonists no reliance whatever can be placed upon the truthfulness of their representations. Indeed, many of the fathers of that period seem to have made it a point of conscience to blacken to the utmost the character of their opponents, and often they exhibit a kind of savage delight while tearing from the victims of their wrath the last shred of virtue, and hurling at them the most stinging epithets they could invent.

Novatian of Rome has been confounded with Novatus of Carthage, by some historians, a mistake easily accounted for by the similarity of their names, and by the fact that they were to a certain extent concerned in the same transactions. Even the bitterest enemies of the former, with the single exception of his rival Cornelius,\* never ventured seriously to asperse his character; and we may safely infer from this that he was a man of exemplary life; for in what they do say of him, it is quite apparent that if they could have discovered so much as a pimple upon his face, it would, in their eyes, speedily have grown into a large and loathsome ulcer.

Of the early years of Novatian little is known beyond the fact that he was born and bred a pagan, and continued such until he had reached mature manhood. Cyprian *inferred* from his rigid principles that he had been educated in the Stoic school, and accused him of bringing its evil leaven with him into the church. If we may credit the scanty accounts respecting him that have come down to us, the earlier spiritual experience of Novatian bore some resemblance to that of Luthier. Under the pressure of an apparently incurable disease he learned the folly of philosophy, the emptiness of the world, and awoke to the awful consciousness

---

\* In a letter to Cyprian he indeed accuses him of "subtlety, perjuries, lies, a churlish and wolfish disposition," but besides being a personal enemy, Cornelius deals only in convenient generalities, which candid historians of all parties regard as the mere ebullition of spite.

of his exposure as a sinner to the wrath of God. After a protracted endurance of intense physical and mental suffering, he found in the gospel of Christ the effectual balm for his wounds. While still confined to the sick bed he was baptized by Fabian, the venerable pastor of Rome, who had formed so high an opinion of his talents, learning, and sincere piety, that he was ordained presbyter so soon as his health was re-established. He discharged the duties of this office for a number of years—historians are not agreed how many—but long enough to make full proof of his fitness for it, and to win the confidence and love of a large portion of the congregation. During the heat of the Decian persecution, he retired from Rome, but kept up in the meanwhile an active correspondence with his flock; and the eagerness with which his advice was sought by Christians of all ranks is the best proof that he held a high place in the esteem and reverence of the people.

As we have already stated, the venerable Fabian was one of the victims of the persecution, and after his decease the Roman pastorate remained vacant for more than a year. Novatian, in a letter to Cyprian written during the vacancy, says, “nondum est episcopus propter rerum et temporum difficultates constitutus,”\* evidently referring the delay to the storm of persecution then raging without the church, and to the difficulties within the church both in regard to the proper person to be chosen, and to the still more important subject of the Lapsed. When the day of election came the partisans of Cornelius proved, or at least claimed to be in the majority; the friends of Novatian, however, were still resolved that he should be their pastor, as the head of an independent congregation if not as the formal successor of Fabian. Immediate steps were taken to carry out their plan, and five of the neighboring bishops came to Rome and ordained him to the pastoral charge of the new society. Novatian and his people, according to the usage of the times, despatched letters and messengers to Alexandria, Carthage, and other prominent churches in the east and west, apprising their pastors of what they had done, and asking their approval. Cornelius, of course, did the same. As the whole

---

\* Opera Novatiani 297. Ed. Jackson, Lond. 1728.

affair presented some novel features, it was so soon as practicable brought to the notice of the Synod of Rome, by which the conduct of Novatian and his congregation were condemned, who thus found themselves reduced to the necessity either of submissively disbanding their new organization, or else of taking their stand as an independent body. They adopted the latter alternative.

Their assuming the position of a distinct sect would thus seem to have been a matter of compulsion, rather than of choice. Neither Novatian nor his people appear to have entertained the thought of seceding from the old communion of the other party; they would have been quite content to remain in their old ecclesiastical relations if allowed a reasonable freedom of opinion and action in regard to the questions then agitating the church. We may fairly infer that such was their plan from the fact of their sending letters to the other churches, and from the whole tone of Novatian's epistle to Cyprian, to the contents of which we shall presently advert. But in this as in so many other ecclesiastical movements, that saying was found true, "man proposes, but God disposes."

Of the personal history of Novatian subsequent to his separation from the dominant church no reliable accounts have come down to us. Neither the time nor the manner of his death is certainly known, though Socrates gives it as a tradition that he died a martyr for the faith of Christ. The few productions of his pen that remain to us show that he was a man of very superior intellect. His longest work is entitled "*The Rule of Faith*,"\* as the object of it is to expound and defend the true Scriptural doctrine, and the true faith of the church respecting the being and perfections of God, and the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ. The last topic is largely discussed, and the treatise abounds with very acute reasonings in support of the tenet that Christ is "very God and very man," based upon the testimonies of the Old Testament. Next we have a short tract on "*Jewish Meats*," which was one of those pastoral epistles which he was accustomed to send to his friends at Rome, from his place of retreat during the heat of the Decian persecution. This little

---

\* It is appended to some editions of the works of Tertullian with the title *De Trinitate*. Jerome speaks of it positively as Novatian's.

piece contains some fanciful expositions of the Mosaic law respecting clean and unclean animals, but it furnishes decisive evidence that its author clearly understood the difference between the Jewish and the Christian economies, and the nature and extent of the liberty wherewith Christ hath made his people free. "Deus ventre non colitur," says he, "nec cibis quos Dominus dicit perire. Nam qui per escas Dominum colit, prope est ut Dominum habeat ventrem suum. Cibus, inquam, verus et sanctus et mundus est, Fides recta, immaculata Conscientia, et innocens Anima; quisquis sic pascitur, Christo convescitur, talis epulator conviva est Dei; istæ sunt epulæ quæ Angelos pascunt, istæ sunt mensæ quæ martyres faciunt," p. 275. Besides the above, there are other two epistles addressed to Cyprian, one of which was written in the name of the Roman clergy, on the vexed question of the Lapsed; its authorship is therefore uncertain, but it is ascribed to Novatian by Dupin, and is included by Jackson among his works. Dupin thus sums up the merits of the man and of his writings: "Cet auteur avoit beaucoup d'esprit, de savoir, et d'eloquence; son stile est pur, net, et poli; ses expressions choisis, ses pensées naturelles, et ses raisonnemens justes. Il est plein de citations de passages de l'écriture sainte rapporter fort à-propos, il y a même beaucoup d'ordre et de methode,—et il parle toujours avec beaucoup de douceur et de moderation."

Let us now look for a moment, a little more closely, at the causes of this schism. The assertion that it originated in the personal ambition of Novatian is so obviously in conflict with all that we know of the man and the movement, that it hardly needs to be discussed. Socrates, the historian, testifies that the sect "flourished mightily" at Rome, at Alexandria, at Constantinople, and many other cities, while in certain provinces of the east, as in Phrygia, it included the great mass of the Christian population. Now mere sympathy for an individual would never have gathered round his standard such multitudes in so many cities and provinces. The more common account is that the schism arose out of the refusal of Novatian to readmit the Lapsed to the communion of the church. Tillemont (*Memoire* iii. 481), Romanist-like, insists that the rigid discipline of Novatian was a mere cover for his ambition, adding that he taught that the Lapsed

should be indeed exhorted to penitence, but should be refused absolution, as the church had no power to remit mortal sin. He however appends the important caveat, "at least this is what S. Pacian and S. Augustine say of him, perhaps attributing to Novatian the sentiments of his followers in after times." One might infer from this that Novatian recognised the Romish distinction of mortal and venial sin. There is not a shadow of evidence that he did so. Socrates, who, if not a member of the Novatian church, certainly had a warm affection for it, says that the sect regarded the offence of the Lapsed, or the public denial of the name of Christ, as "the sin unto death," described by John, and that consequently those who fell into it should not be again admitted into the fellowship of the faithful; they should be urged to repent of it, but at the same time should be left in the hands of God who looketh upon the heart, and could alone judge of the sincerity of their repentance. But there is no proof that the founder of the sect held even this precise tenet, which widely differs from the Romish doctrine of mortal sin.

In the epistle to Cyprian already quoted, Novatian says: "*Absit enim ab ecclesia Romana vigorem suum tam profana facilitate dimittere, et nervos severitatis eversa fidei majestate dissolvere. Ubi enim poterit indulgentiæ medicinæ procedere, si etiam ipse medicus, intercepta pœnitentia indulget periculis? Si tantum modo operit vulnus, nec sinit necessaria temporis remedia obducere cicatricem? Hoc non est curare, sed, si dicere verum volumus, occidere.*" Then after stating that the difficulties of the subject had been much enhanced by the death of Fabian, "a man of most noble memory," he goes on to explain his own wishes. "Quamquam nobis in tam ingenti negotio placeat, quod et tu (Cyprianus) ipse tractasti; *prius ecclesiæ pacem sustinendam; deinde sic collatione consiliorum cum Episcopis, Presbyteris, Diaconis, Confessoribus, pariter ac stantibus Laicis facta, Lapsorum tractare rationem.*" He then bespeaks the earnest prayers of his brother. "Oremus pro Lapsis ut erigantur, oremus pro stantibus, ut non ad ruinas usque tentantur." Finally, adverting to the proper behavior of the Lapsed themselves, he says, "Pulsent sane fores, sed non utique contringant. Adeant ad limen ecclesiæ, sed non ut tran-

saliant. *Castrorum cœlestium excubunt portis, sed armati modestia qua intelligant si desertores fuisse.*" He would have them "behold the kindness and the severity of God;" and remember that he who said "I forgave thee all that debt," also said "whoso shall deny me before men, him will I also deny;" that he who invited all to the marriage feast, also said of the man who had not on the wedding garment, "bind him hand and foot, and cast him out." Now these are neither the sentiments nor the words of the ambitious demagogue or of the fanatical disciplinarian. Indeed the whole epistle, from which we have quoted, breathes the spirit of moderation, and is evidently the production of a conscientious man, keenly alive to the evils which threatened the purity of the church, and anxious to remove them by the use of wise and gentle, yet energetic remedies.

The origin, therefore, of Novatianism or Primitive Puritanism, is to be sought not in the disappointed ambition of the man who gave name to the schism, nor in the dissensions in the Roman church in regard to the single question what should be done with the Lapsed, but in the growing corruption of the church at large, and the consequent struggles of her faithful members to resist the process of declension. At Carthage, the contest in the first instance was against an incoming prelacy; at Rome it was against laxity of discipline. We do not suppose that the Novatians were themselves wholly exempt from the errors of their times, and it is quite possible that they, like the English Puritans of later days, carried some parts of their disciplinary system to an unwarrantable extreme. But their grand design was beyond a doubt essentially the same as that for which the Puritans of Britain "resisted unto blood,"—to render broad and visible the distinction between the church and the world, and so far as human agency can go, to make the former in reality, what she is in name and by profession, a company of saints.

Accordingly we find that so soon as the news of the ejection of Novatian from the Roman church reached the other cities of the empire, multitudes in them at once arrayed themselves under his standard; while the regions which were most noted for their attachment to the pure faith and simple order of apostolic times, were precisely the localities in which the new sect most vigorously flourished. The



churches of Phrygia, for example, according to the testimony of Socrates, maintained a strictness of faith and morals closely resembling that which obtained in New England two centuries ago; these Phrygian churches, with hardly an exception, ranged themselves on the side of Novatian the instant they were made acquainted with the transactions at Rome, and they adhered to the cause of Puritanism with an undeviating steadfastness for two centuries or more. The same thing was true of the western churches; in north Italy, in the south of France, in the districts along the foot of the Alps, the regions in which the living and life-giving Christianity of apostolic times was most faithfully preached, and whose churches were least contaminated by the leaven of iniquity at work in them, the views of Novatian most widely prevailed. The political as well as spiritual power wielded by the bishops of Rome, after the union of the church and state, and the removal of the seat of empire to the banks of the Bosphorus, enabled them to crush the Puritanism of the west, or at least to compel it to seek a refuge amid the Alpine mountains; but the fact is undeniable, that for a century and a half or more, the whole of central and northern Italy abounded with flourishing Novatian churches, which ceased to exist simply because they were put down by the strong arm of ecclesiastical despotism.

The authentic annals of the Novatians during the palmy days of their existence as a distinct body, and onward until they disappear from history, have all perished. We are therefore mainly dependent for our information respecting them upon the scanty and prejudiced accounts of their principles and policy given by writers belonging to the dominant church. But scanty as these notices are, they abundantly vindicate the claim of the Novatians to the honored name of Puritans. In all the subsequent persecutions of the church, and especially in the last and bloodiest one under Diocletian, no class of Christians suffered more than they for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ. So, too, amid the stormy contests between Orthodox and Arian, which arose soon after the overthrow of Paganism, and for many years convulsed the church and the empire, none exhibited a more unwavering steadfastness in defence of the vital doctrine in dispute, and none endured a

greater "fight of affliction" for their tenacious love of it, than the Novatians. In that great battle for the truth of Christ, they were in the front rank of the sacramental-host; and accordingly, in the moments of Arian triumph, on their heads descended the full force of Arian vengeance. Their heroic valor in this holy war elicited from the very church against whose corruptions they had so long protested, eulogies similar to those which Sancroft and other high church prelates under James II. bestowed upon their "non-conforming brethren" who had come to their rescue in the hour of their peril. The sins of the Novatians as "schismatics," were for the moment forgotten in the admiration awakened for their virtues as Orthodox Christians.

The famous Edict of Milan, A. D. 313, by which the persecution that had raged against the church was authoritatively ended, was expressly extended to the Novatians, and placed them in common with the larger Christian body under the protection of the law. Constantine was very desirous to terminate, if possible, the long standing schism, and to include the Novatian congregations in the new arrangement which he had resolved to carry out with reference to the church at large. Whether or not they considered, as many now do, the intimate relation between the state and the church, which the emperor was prepared to establish, inconsistent with the purity and the spiritual independence of the church of Christ, we have no means to determine with absolute certainty. But their well known, jealous, perhaps we may say, extreme anxiety for a pure communion, and a strict discipline, renders it highly probable that their refusal to come under the wing of the state arose out of the conviction, that if they accepted the proffered boon it must be at the expense of freedom, and that henceforth it would be impossible to keep up a broad and visible distinction between the church and the world. Be this as it may, they declined the overtures of the emperor; they steadily refused to have any share of the wealth and the honors which Constantine showered so profusely upon the ecclesiastics of that day, and which they were so eager to secure. It was a great temptation, too great in fact to be resisted by men not governed by principle. We have no doubt, that the leading ministers of the Novatian body

would have found no serious difficulty in the way of their obtaining a comfortable position beneath the broad shadow of the tree of state, if they had chosen to make the effort, even though they had persisted in their refusal to be formally amalgamated with the self-styled Catholic church. As yet there was no venerable and powerful Establishment, with whose "might and mastery" it was dangerous to trifle, and whose pride would be deeply wounded by the admission of vulgar dissenters to her lofty platform; neither is it probable that Constantine was, at this period, the bigot to Catholicity that he afterwards became. Policy, untrammelled by conscientious principle, could have easily discovered avenues and arts by which a church stigmatized by its enemies as schismatic, might, in common with its rival, have basked in the sunshine of imperial favor.

But the Novatians neither asked the state to enrich them with princely endowments, nor to erect for them stately temples; they simply desired to be protected, and to be let alone. This was a moderate and just demand; but those who made it soon discovered to their cost, that if the church had expelled the old Paganism from the palace of the Cæsars, she had not driven out the old spirit of persecution, and that if they would not allow the emperor to befriend them in his own way, they should learn from bitter experience what it was to be counted as his enemies. Their ecclesiastical edifices and other property were transferred by an imperial edict to the established church, and the meetings of the Novatians for religious worship were, by the same authority, in various ways restrained. It must have been a strange spectacle to see a Christian government, in the first moment of its power, persecuting its Christian subjects as if they had been the vilest of heretics, and the undisguised enemies of religion. But these ancient Puritans, like their noble namesakes of a later age, "took joyfully the spoiling of their goods," and were busy only to preserve and propagate the truth of God.

This state of things lasted for nearly ten years. During a considerable part of this period, Constantine was too much occupied with political affairs to allow of his looking after the rigid enforcement of his proscriptive laws against "sectarians and non-conformists," and many of them probably were

a dead letter. But they were not rescinded until after Arianism had arisen to convulse the established church, and to give the Novatians a fresh opportunity of exhibiting their unbending orthodoxy. As we have before intimated, their conduct during the progress of that memorable controversy so emphatically vindicated the purity of their principles and character, that the hostility of the emperor and of the dominant church was very much abated. The doors of the "Catholic communion" were again thrown wide open for their admission, and earnest efforts were made to induce them to come in. When the memorable council of Nice was invoked, Acesius, the Novatian pastor of Constantinople, was expressly invited by the emperor to assist in its deliberations, an honor which was conferred upon no other sect. It is possible that Acesius attended the discussions as a spectator, but it is evident from a conversation reported by Socrates and Sozomen as having taken place between him and Constantine soon after the dissolution of the synod, that he was not a member of it. After the formal publication of the Nicene confession, the emperor asked Acesius if he agreed to it. "My prince," replied he, "I know of nothing new determined by the council. I have always understood, that from the beginning, from the very days of the apostles, the same definition of the faith has been handed down to us." "Why then," asked the emperor, "do you separate yourself from our communion?" Acesius then explained to him what had happened during the persecution by Decius, when many fell from the profession of their faith and relapsed into idolatry; and spake of the rule which forbade the admission to the sacred mysteries of those who, after baptism, had committed a sin which the Scriptures declare to be a sin unto death. "They ought indeed," he added, "to be urged to repentance, but should not be encouraged to hope for pardon through the ministrations of the priests. They should look directly to God, who alone can judge of the sincerity of their repentance, and who alone has the power and prerogative of remitting sins." "Take a ladder, then, Acesius," replied the emperor, "and ascend alone to heaven."

The eighth canon of the council of Nice, though not very gracious in its tone, and in some measure breathing the haughty spirit of "the church as by law established," clearly

enough indicates that the venerable fathers were not without hopes of winning back the hitherto scrupulous Puritans to their communion. In this canon the conditions of union are defined. But they were again destined to be disappointed. The Novatians as a body persisted in standing aloof from the established church. It may be said, that they were prompted to act thus,—to repel the advances of brethren with whom they should have joined, and presented one unbroken phalanx against the inroads of Arian heresy, by that sectarian spirit which has often kept alive parties in the church long after the original causes of their existence had been removed. The grounds of the Novatian schism, however, were not, properly speaking, dogmatic. The views of the Nicene and Novatian fathers on the leading doctrinal points embodied in the so called Apostles', and in the Nicene creed, were essentially the same. But the reasons which led the early Novatians, after they had been thrust out of the dominant church, to take up an antagonistic position, and to found a separate communion, still existed in full force. Even ten years of relentless persecution had not eradicated from the visible body of Christ the evil leaven which had been so long working among its wide-spread membership. These ten dismal years may have checked the process of declension, but the succeeding ten years of imperial favor and state patronage had given it a fresh impulse, rapidly developing the old tendencies to superstition and will-worship in the liturgic services of the church, and to a hierarchal prelacy with its diverse ranks of clergy in her constitution.

The isolated and antagonistic position of the Novatian church with reference to the larger body, and the total cessation of visible fellowship between them, were necessarily calculated to keep the former rooted and grounded in their original principles, and to preserve them from many of the superstitious practices prevalent in the established church. In such circumstances, men are naturally disposed to watch with the utmost vigilance a society which they have been accustomed to denounce as corrupt, in order to discover fresh grounds for their hostile attitude, and their condemnatory testimony. This supposition is exactly coincident with the scanty notices of the Novatians by the later fathers.

From these we learn that they condemned *the use of oil in baptism; prayers for the dead; and the worship of martyrs.* But we are not to imagine that their non-conformity with the dominant church was confined to these three points; though, in the absence of their own authentic records, we cannot enumerate all the particular unscriptural and superstitious usages rejected by them. Still their uncompromising opposition to the three above-named salient features of the "mystery of iniquity," is of itself sufficient to stamp them as belonging to the noble "cloud of witnesses," and to warrant their assumption of the name of Puritans. However, this is not the only proof that the Novatian communion was to a far greater degree exempt from superstitious rites and ceremonies, and included a larger share of intelligent scriptural piety than any other portion of the nominal church. We refer to the testimony of Socrates, the continuator of Eusebius.

Socrates of Constantinople was bred a lawyer, and for some years prosecuted his profession in his native city with diligence and success, but at length abandoned the bar, and addicted himself exclusively to the study of ecclesiastical history. In early life he had enjoyed the best educational advantages of the metropolis, and we have no doubt that his training as a jurist, and his practice in the courts of law, materially contributed to qualify him for the work to which in the maturity of his manhood he devoted himself, of writing the ecclesiastical annals of his age. He seems to have been a man of sincere piety, of good sound sense, who, living in a city and at a period notorious for the bigotry and violence of their ecclesiastical factions, preserved the spirit of moderation, and weighed with candor the merits and demerits of the various parties by which the church was divided. Baronius and Labbeus, following Nicephorus, peremptorily insist that Socrates was a member of the Novatian communion; but Valesius, who somewhat largely discusses the question in the preface to his edition of the history of Socrates and Sozomen, has clearly proved that they were mistaken, though he admits that the reasons of this opinion are "*nec pauca, nec leves.*" In other words, the historian recognises and faithfully depicts the various virtues of the Novatians, and on several occasions betrays not only a warm affection

for the men, with many of whom he was personally acquainted, but a decided sympathy with their principles. Thus when giving a summary of the early history of the body (iv. 24), he almost goes the length of endorsing, in so many words, the rigid discipline of Novatian in regard to the Lapsed; and expressly testifies, not only that multitudes in the east and west approved, but that they included the largest share of the holiest men and the purest churches of that day. He refers in particular to the Paphlagonians and Phrygians, and to the high standard of morals that obtained among them, and then adds the remark, "it is certainly true that they live *σωφρονιστερον* than the men of any other sect."

Of the Novatian church at Constantinople, and of its various fortunes under Orthodox and Arian emperors, Socrates supplies us with a good deal of valuable information; yet we much regret that one so competent to the task, and withal so candid, did not deem it worth his while to describe their internal organization. He has also given portraits more or less complete of the succession of pastors from the times of Constantine down to his own. Some of them were men of rare gifts as preachers and authors, while all of them were illustrious examples of primitive apostolic piety. One of them, Sisinnius, was evidently an especial favorite of our historian, who says that he wrote a large number of books, and was held in high esteem by prelates of "the church" and persons of senatorial rank for his distinguished attainments in philosophy, logic, and biblical learning, as well as for his ready wit. Though by no means puritanical in the material and style of his ordinary dress, he seems to have been a Puritan of the extremest sort in regard to his ecclesiastical vestments. The pulpit dress of that day, Socrates relates, was *black*. Sisinnius, however, was accustomed to preach in *white*. He was one day taken to task for this violation of rule by a member of "the church," who asked him, "where is it written in Scripture that a bishop should appear in a *white* garment?" "Give me first," retorted Sisinnius, "the passage in which it is said he shall wear black." His censor was, of course, silenced. "You can find no such text—but I will give my authority from Scripture; for does not Solomon exhort us, saying, let thy garment always be *white*?" Socrates quotes other illustrations

of the ready wit of Sisinnius, but we have given this one because it appears to us plainly to imply that one of the well known and distinctive principles of the Novatians was the supreme authority of Scripture as the rule of faith and manners. Else why should the churchman have demanded from the dissenter his *Scriptural* authority for his unusual dress, unless he fancied that he had a fine chance for a hit at the Puritanism which refused to observe ordinances having no other warrant than such as was derived from tradition or the church?

But the historian who records this piece of pleasantry, has supplied us with more decisive evidence of the fact, that one of the distinguishing features of the Primitive Puritans was their recognition of the Bible as the exclusive rule of faith and life. In his 5th Book there is a very remarkable chapter (22) bearing upon this point, from which we should be glad to make large extracts, if our limits allowed. It exhibits the judgment of Socrates concerning the diversity of usage that then existed in Christendom in regard to Easter, baptism, fasting, religious assemblies, and other ecclesiastical rites. Referring to the famous dispute about Easter, he says, "Now it seems to me that in this matter neither the ancients nor the moderns have sufficiently considered, that when the Jewish law was superseded by the Christian worship, the observance of the Mosaic ceremonies entirely ceased. It is most clearly demonstrable, not only that there is no law of Christ which permits Christians to judaize—*ἰουδαΐζειν*—but that the apostle expressly forbids them to do so. Certainly the apostles never imposed upon those to whom they preached, such a yoke of bondage, as to require them to keep Easter and other festivals. *But as men are very fond of such days*, because they bring rest from daily toil—*διὰ τὸ ἀνιισταί των πόνοι ἢ αὐταῖς*—they were gradually established by the force of custom. So it was with Easter, the observance of which gradually became a general custom—it was ordained by none of the apostles, but grew up *ἐξ ἑθνῶς*." He then gives an extended description of the variety of usage that obtained in the church; in the course of which he remarks that, "no religious sect has the same ceremonies in their worship; even those who hold the same doctrines and the same faith differ widely among themselves



in their religious rites. Among all sects (the context shows that he includes the "Catholics") you will hardly find two churches whose modes of prayer are identical." Adverting to the miserable disputes then so common about times and forms of worship, he quotes the decrees of the apostolic synod at Jerusalem, and adds, "nowadays there are many who, despising these apostolic laws, look upon whoredom as a very small matter, yet fight for their festivals *ἐκ τῆς πόλεως*." Finally he comes to the wise conclusion that, "*as no one can pretend to bring a law of Christ, or of his Apostles, imposing these and the like rites and ceremonies upon Christians, every man should be left free to follow the dictates of his own conscience; to determine for himself whether he will receive or reject them, and that none should be compelled to observe them through necessity or fear.*"

Socrates relates, that among the Novatians this rule obtained in regard to the festival of Easter. It was formally decided by one of their synods, that as the Scriptures laid down no rule on this subject, the church had no right to enact one; that it belonged to the class of "things indifferent," and that therefore each congregation was entitled to fix for itself the time of keeping Easter; or if its members so pleased, not to keep it at all. In the chapter from which we have quoted, the historian claims to speak for himself alone; to give his own private sentiments on the topics discussed in it; but there can be no doubt that he also gave utterance to the distinctive opinions of the Puritanism of that age—opinions which it is quite probable he had himself imbibed from his daily intercourse with these Bible-loving and intelligent Christians. The reason why the overtures for union made by the Nicene fathers failed, now becomes quite obvious. The hearty amalgamation of two such bodies was impossible; for their foundation principles were as antagonistic as light and darkness. Such is the teaching of the church history of all ages. We may bring the representatives of these principles into the same visible society, or into one ecclesiastical establishment, like that of England, but after all, their unity is mere conformity. Their only common bond is the chain that binds them to the state. The church of England at the Reformation tried to bring these opposite principles into harmony, and for a time thought she had succeeded,

but she speedily discovered that, like the wife of Isaac, she had "two nations in her womb, and that two manner of people should be separated from her bowels." Perhaps we may add, that before her career is fully run, she may find the latter part of the above prediction no less applicable to her case—"the one people shall be stronger than the other people, and the elder shall serve the younger."

But the limits of this article forbid our prosecuting the subject further for the present. Enough, we apprehend, has been said to convince the candid reader that those who in the earlier ages of the church bore the name of Puritans, were not undeserving of the appellation; that the Primitive Puritanism and the Puritanism of later times have many features in common. There were other bodies of Christians that came into existence at a later period, and which occupying essentially the same stand-point with the Novatians, were equally entitled to the name of Puritans—such as the Luciferians, the Ærians, the Paulicians, and others. Their history is full of interest, and deserves to be better known than it is. But the Novatians were the first to win and wear the appellation; they were the earliest organized body that appears in the long line of faithful witnesses against the corruptions of the nominal church. That this line reaches back to those early ages, it is impossible to doubt. "The Christian church," says Monastier,\* "did not quit the narrow path of sound doctrine, the purity and simplicity of her hidden life with Christ, without encountering a protracted resistance on the part of her sound members. Who, he adds, can recount all the efforts put forth to turn aside so great a misfortune, to prevent so sad a shipwreck?" The earthly records of the struggles and sufferings of these noble bands of faithful men among the faithless, have long since perished; only a few isolated fragments survive, and it is therefore impossible to do full justice to their memory, by showing how much after generations owe to their resistance against the incoming tide of worldliness and superstition. Still we may well believe, that the influence of a body like the Novatian, so widely diffused, including such multitudes

---

\* Histoire de l'Eglise Vaudoise, i. 16.

of intelligent Christians, with not a few eloquent preachers and able authors, a body untrammelled by state control, except as it was the object of proscriptive laws, and boldly displaying a banner because of Truth and Purity, must have been powerful, at least in particular localities, in the way of impeding the onward course of a declining church. They, unquestionably, were the persons of whom Celestine of Rome, about the middle of the fifth century, so bitterly complains as "the troublers of Israel" in North Italy. The patriarchs of Alexandria were vexed by multitudes of "troublers" of the same sort, and continued to be down to the memorable epoch when churchmen and schismatics were swept away by the overflowing flood of the Saracen invasion. They could not stay the development of the mystery of iniquity, nor prevent the appearance of the Man of Sin in the temple of God, but in ages of festering corruption they kept their own garments clean, they fought a good fight, and gained for themselves imperishable renown.

---

ART. VII.—THE RESURRECTION; THE CONFLAGRATION;  
THE JUDGMENT.

A correspondent addresses to us the following inquiries, to which, as they are of interest to our readers generally, we reply through the Journal.

1. "How do you reconcile Daniel's prophecy, chap. xii. 2, with the resurrection of the saints at the beginning, and of the wicked at the close of the millennial period ?

2. "Regarding as I do the language of 2 Peter iii. 4-13 as literal throughout, I must believe all the wicked then living to be doomed to destruction (see a kindred passage, 2 Thess. i. 8, 9), and the heavens and earth to be subjected to purification by fire so as to become a fit abode for Christ and his glorified saints. Now the wicked being slain, and the risen and changed saints not being subject to the law of marriage (Matt. xxii. 30), and therefore not propagating their species, whence shall come those nations over whom

Messiah with his risen saints shall rule in the millennial ages? I admit the doctrine of a rule over the Gentile nations (see Zech. xiv. 16, and many other passages), but I cannot *account* for successive generations of men with 2 Peter iii. 4-13, 2 Thess. i. 8, 9, and Matthew xxii. 30, before me.

3. "How do you reconcile Matthew's account, chap. xxv. 31-46, of one simultaneous judgment of 'all nations,' the separation of the sheep from the goats (thus implying the promiscuous assemblage of both up to the moment of discrimination), and the reward given to each according to their deeds on the one great occasion, with two different and widely remote periods of judgment, as indicated by the Apocalypse xx.?"

To these questions we return the following answers.

#### I. THE RESURRECTION. DANIEL XII. 1-3.

"And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince who standeth for the children of thy people; and then shall be a time of trouble such as there never was since there was a nation even to that same time; and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.

"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

"And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever."

The impression that this annunciation of the resurrection of the two classes of the dead is apparently inconsistent with the revelation made in the New Testament, that the unrighteous are to be raised at a far later period than the righteous, springs obviously from the assumption that the passage represents or implies that the resurrection of the evil, as well as the just, is to take place contemporaneously with Michael's interposition to deliver his people in the time of their great tribulation. That, however, is mistaken. There is no specification in v. 2 that the resurrection is to occur at the same time as the deliverance of the Israelites by Michael,<sup>1</sup> such as there is v. 1, that their deliverance is to be wrought at

identically the time of their great danger and distress. Instead, v. 2 is a simple announcement that the multitudes of the dead are to awake—some to life and glory, and some to shame and dishonor, under the interposition and reign of Michael the great prince of the Israelites and monarch of the earth, who, it had been revealed, chap. vii., is to come in the clouds of heaven, assume the sceptre of the world, and invest his saints with its dominion, at the time of the overthrow of the fourth monarchy, symbolized by the ten-horned beast; precisely as in John v. 28, 29, there is a prediction of the resurrection of the two classes of the dead by Christ's voice, without any intimation that the resurrection of those who have done evil is not to take place at the same time as that of the righteous. "The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." There is no indication of the period of the resurrection, except that it is to be under the personal presence and reign of Michael, *i. e.* Christ, as the prince of his people and monarch of the world. The verb, "shall stand up," is used by hypocatastasis to denote that Christ shall then appear personally, and act in his station as the great prince of the earth. To stand up is to assume the attitude of conspicuity and action. The prediction that Christ is then to stand up, is a prediction, therefore, that he is then openly to assume his station as the king of Israel and of the earth, and to exert the official acts that belong to that station; and among the great acts that are to mark his reign, is the resurrection of the dead—the holy to life, the unholy to shame.

The resurrection of the holy dead, indeed, instead of taking place at the same time as the deliverance of the Israelites from their great trouble, it is indicated, chap. vii., is to precede that crisis. The saints who are to take the kingdom at the destruction of the fourth monarchy, and possess it for ever and ever under Christ, are undoubtedly the risen and glorified saints; for it is they who are to reign with him during the thousand years, Rev. xx. 4–6. But the saints who are to take and possess the kingdom during his reign are symbolized, Dan. ii. 35, 44, 45, by the stone cut

out of the mountain without hands, which was the instrument by which the image was smitten and destroyed. "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom—*i. e.* the kingly power in it—shall not be left to other people, but it, *i. e.* the new dynasty or body of kingly saints, shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms; and it shall stand for ever. Forasmuch as, *i. e.* according as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold;—the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter." In like manner it is revealed, Rev. xix. 14, that the risen saints are to attend Christ at his descent to destroy the wild beast, false prophet, and their armies, at the battle of Armageddon. The same revelation is made also Zech. xiv. 1-5, Rev. ii. 26, 27.

As then the saints are to be raised *before* the interposition of Christ to deliver the Israelites from their tribulation, though *after* he assumes the sceptre of the earth, Rev. xi. 15, the annunciation, v. 2, of the resurrection of the two classes of the dead, is obviously a mere annunciation of their resurrection under his reign, without any specification of the moment when it is to take place, or implication that both classes are to be raised at the same time.

There is no inconsistency, therefore, of this prediction with the revelation made in the New Testament that the resurrection of the unholy is not to take place till long after that of the righteous.

## II. THE CONFLAGRATION. 2 PETER III. 3-13.

"Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last of the days mockers, walking according to their own inordinate desires, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as from the beginning of the creation. For they are willingly ignorant [or inconsiderate] of this: that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of water and in water, through which [that is, the heavens from which the rain fell, and the land which was depressed beneath the ocean] the world of that time was destroyed [that is, made a waste]. But the

present heavens and earth are by the same word treasured up for fire; reserved to the day of judgment and destruction of the men that are impious. But let it not be unknown to [or escape] you, beloved, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not dilatory respecting the promise, as some count dilatoriness; but is long suffering toward us; not desiring that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.

"But the day of the Lord will come as a thief, in which the heavens will pass with a rushing noise; and the elements being kindled will melt; and the earth and the works on it will be burned. As then all these are (to be) loosed [let loose], what manner of persons ought ye to be in holy deportment and piety, looking for and earnestly awaiting the coming of the day of God, in which the heavens being inflamed shall be let loose [to rush in fiery whirlwinds], and the elements being fired shall melt. New heavens, however, and a new earth, we according to his promise look for, in which righteousness dwells."

Those of our readers who are familiar with Greek, will see that this translation is the literal counterpart of the text, and gives the sense of the several parts just as it is expressed in the original. *Οἱ οὐρανοί*, the heavens, are the atmosphere merely, the region of winds, clouds, and reflected light; as in the expressions, "the fowls of heaven," "the rain of heaven," "the clouds of heaven." The statement that *ὁ τότε κόσμος ἀπόλετο*, the world of that time was destroyed, denotes simply that it was destroyed as to its inhabiteness; not that it was annihilated, or subjected to a total dissolution of its parts. It was destroyed as an inhabitable world, by the submersion of all its land beneath the sea, precisely as a road built on a quicksand is said to be destroyed when it sinks beneath the surface; and a house when it is overthrown by a tempest, though the change that takes place is a mere change of position, by which it is unfitted for the purpose for which it was erected: not an annihilation, or even a dispersion of its parts. *Τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων*, are the men that are eminently wicked, the impious; not the sinful simply, for the renewed are still sinful; nor the men unregenerate, for many of them, and especially the young, are not impious. *Παριλεύσονται* shall pass, in the expression, the heavens, i.e. the atmosphere shall pass with a rushing noise, means simply that it

shall rush by in the form of a wind, like a tornado; not that it shall be annihilated, or vanish into space, and leave the earth in a vacuum. The literal meaning of the verb is, to pass along by; and that it is used in its literal sense, is clear from the consideration that the movement which it denotes is to be *გაიქვით*, with a loud noise, as of a rushing wind. It is employed, therefore, literally to signify an actual movement of the atmosphere along the surface of the earth; not metaphorically, to express some analogous change, such as annihilation, which would involve no motion in space, and produce no noise. If, instead of being employed literally, it were used by a metaphor to denote some change that merely resembles a motion in space, or the effect of such a movement, such as a disappearance like that of a body that by its motion passes out of sight, or a ceasing to be; then the idea of motion in space would be dropped, and only the analogous idea of ceasing to be, be retained. But the idea of motion is not here dropped, but is the identical act which the verb describes, as is seen from the fact, that the act it denotes, is to produce a loud noise, as of a rushing wind; which could not be, except by a real, and a violent and agitated movement. No terms could have been used that would have more absolutely defined the event denoted as a movement of the air according to its ordinary laws, as in a whirlwind or tornado; and excluded the idea of cessation from being or vanishing into distant space. As then the event which it denotes, would have its full accomplishment in furious blasts and rushing whirlwinds, like those that result from volcanic eruptions, the whole meaning of the verb is confined to that. No such sense attaches to it, therefore, such as that ascribed to it by commentators who seem to regard it as denoting a rush of the air from the globe into distant space. Such a meaning is as unphilosophical indeed, as it is groundless and contradictory to the language. If, as those writers suppose, the atmosphere were to fly from the earth, it would not be merely by its being released from the force of gravity, but by being endowed with a positive repellent force, or else subjected to a powerful attraction from some other body; for if simply released from the force of gravity, it would be *the earth* that would fly from *the atmosphere*, not the atmosphere that would fly



from the earth. But the first would divest it of its power of producing sound, no matter how rapid its motion might be; since if deprived of weight, it would be as incapable of vibration as blank space is; and even if still susceptible of vibration, could produce no impression on the ear; as weight and impulse are necessary to give motion to the drum of the ear, and excite the sensation of sound. It could not, therefore, produce the loud rushing noise that is to attend its motion. The supposition of its being imbued with a repellent force, by which it should fly from the earth, is equally inconsistent with its nature, and would equally divest it of its power of producing by its departure the sensation of sound. What can be more unphilosophical than to suppose that the laws of matter are thus to be wholly reversed, or the earth and air invested with a new nature in order to their destruction! Are these writers aware of the existence of any such repellent force in the universe, as, if transfused into the atmosphere or earth, would instantly drive them asunder? Is not gravity a property of all matter, and is not its law demonstrably from the movements of the heavenly bodies, the same in all other spheres as in this? What right have these speculatists to assume that that power is to be struck from the atmosphere, and a directly opposite principle substituted in its place, in order that they may give a color of authority to their theory of the annihilation at that crisis of the atmosphere, and the destruction thereby of all the human beings then dwelling on the globe? They surely cannot have considered what their assumption involves. But the supposition of the atmosphere's being endowed with such a repellent force, is equally fatal to their scheme; as it would divest it of its power of producing a sensation of sound as it receded from the earth: for as it would then fly off at every point, in a line perpendicular to the surface of the earth, as soon as it had risen above the ears of men—which would be as quick as thought—it would cease to act on their ears, and be incapable of producing a sense of the rushing noise which is to attend the movement that is predicted in this passage. Men, moreover, left in such a vacuum, and struggling on the one hand with the agonies of suffocation, and on the other with the still greater agonies of the expansion of their

bodies and the effusion of blood from every pore consequent on their being freed from the pressure of the atmosphere, would have little leisure for, or power of giving attention to the noise of the retreating atmosphere as it receded into remote space, on the supposition that its rush were perceptible by the ear. Had these writers carefully considered what their construction involves, they would have shrunk from ascribing to the passage such a tissue of impossibilities and absurdities.

*στοιχεῖα*, are the elements or simple substances of which the world or its different parts consist. They have been supposed by some writers to denote those chiefly of the atmosphere, and the vapors and other material substances that ordinarily float in it. There is no ground, however, in the language for such a limitation; and in v. 10 they undoubtedly denote the inflammable substances that are then to be ejected from the earth into the air. Neither the atmosphere in fact, nor the water that floats in it, in the form of vapor and clouds, is capable of fusion by heat. They are naturally fluids, not made such in distinction from solids, by the application of heat. The effect on them of a high measure of heat is simply to expand them into a greater volume; to convert them into thinner fluids; not to divest them of solidity, which does not belong to their nature. Melting is a process of which solids alone are susceptible. It is the mineral substances of the globe, therefore, undoubtedly, that are to be ejected into the atmosphere at the period, that are denoted by *στοιχεῖα*, elementary substances, v. 10, that are to be kindled and let loose. *καυσούμενα*, signifies being set on fire, kindled, put in a blaze. The elements that are thus to be enkindled are doubtless those that are naturally inflammable, such as carbon, sulphur, and gases of which they or other inflammable substances are ingredients. *λυθήσονται* is used in the sense of let loose, as the burning elements of a volcano are when projected into the atmosphere, and driven by furious blasts, they become the means of assailing and destroying men. The verb literally denotes, to untie, to loosen, to unbind, to set free from a physical restraint, like a bond or fetter. It does not involve the idea at all, therefore, of the cessation or annihilation of that which is let loose. Instead, it

implies that it continues in its state of release, and that if there has been any cessation of existence, it is of the bond or force from which it is released. In like manner, a sense of annihilation, or ceasing to be, is not involved at all in its use when employed by a metaphor to denote a resembling release of persons or things from a condition like that of being tied or bound with a fetter; as the loosing a slave from bondage, which is a political change; the freeing the body from pain, which is a change of sensation; and the release of a person from death. In all these metaphorical uses of the verb, the continued existence of that which is released, and in its proper nature, is implied in its being set free. So also to loose a seal is to break its continuity simply, not to annihilate it, or produce a chemical dissolution of its parts; and to take down a building, is merely to remove its timbers, stones, and other elements, from that orderly arrangement and connexion with each other, by which it is constituted a building; not to destroy the materials of which it consists, or change the form in which they severally exist. The stones are still stones, the timber is still timber, and all the other elements remain precisely what they were before. The verb does not, therefore, in any form involve the sense of the annihilation or absolute destruction of that which is unloosed; but, instead, necessarily implies its continuance. In this instance, it is used by a metaphor to signify that the elements of the kindled earth are let loose from the force by which they are naturally held in a condition that is compatible with the safety and enjoyment of men; and like the fluid matter of a volcano projected into the atmosphere, are at liberty to rush upon them and become the engines of their destruction. It does not involve, nor admit of the notion of their chemical dissolution and annihilation, any more than the loosing of the ox or ass from the stall to lead it to watering, Luke xiii. 15, or the loosing of the colt bound at the gate, Mark xi. 4, implied the chemical dissolution and annihilation of those animals. Its meaning in each case is simply that of letting loose; though the restraint from which the elements are set free is of a different kind from that from which the animals were released by untying or removing their fastenings.

"And the earth and the works on it καταστροφήται shall be

burned." The earth and the works on it are not the same as the kindled elements which are to be let loose, but are combustible things on the surface of the earth, such as crops, grass, trees, and structures erected by men, on which those burning elements, projected into the atmosphere and borne off by the winds, will fall, and kindle, and burn them. To suppose that the burning elements, and the natural and artificial objects on the earth are the same, would be to treat the passage as tautological. If the elements, and the earth, and the works on it, are the same, and the prediction that the kindled elements shall be let loose, means, as the common construction represents, that they shall be dissolved and reduced to a chaos, or annihilated, why is it added that the earth and the works on it shall be burned? It would imply that the earth and the works on it are to continue to be the earth and the works on it, and therefore to continue to subsist in their natural state, after they have undergone a total dissolution and passed out of existence. Instead of such a contradictory sense, the representation of the passage is, that the burning of the earth and the works on it is to be consequential on the letting loose of the kindled elements. The combustible matter with which the surface of the earth is to be covered—grass, crops, trees, buildings—is to be set on fire by the kindled elements projected into the atmosphere, and burned as usually takes place in volcanic eruptions.

Τούτων οὖν πάντων λυμίνων; As then all these are (to be) unloosed [to become instruments of destruction], what manner of persons ought ye to be?" All these, means not only the kindled elements and the atmosphere, but the burning substances also on the surface of the earth, which the elements falling from the atmosphere are to kindle.

Ποταποὺς διὲν ὑπάρχειν ὑμῶς; ἐν ἁγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις προσδοκῶντας καὶ σπιύδοντας. The distinction between holy deportment and piety, is, that the one has a special reference to men, the other to God. Προσδοκῶντας καὶ σπιύδοντας, as well as ἡμῶς, are governed by διὲν ὑπάρχειν; and the sense of the passage is;—all these then—the kindled elements, the atmosphere, and the burning substances on the surface of the earth—being thus to be unloosed from their natural state to become instruments of destruction to the impious; how holy ought your deportment to be towards men, and your hearts towards

God, that you may not be among those who are then to perish; and how ought you to live in the expectation of the coming of that day, and realization that the kindled atmosphere is then to be let loose, and the burning elements of the earth to melt, and carry terror and death to those who are arrayed against God. The certainty that these resistless instruments of death are to be let loose for the destruction of the impious, is thus made the ground by the apostle of enforcing the duty on the one hand of a life of uprightness towards men, and piety towards God, and on the other of an habitual looking for and earnest contemplation of the day of God, as to be marked by those awful evolutions of the powers of nature, and employment for the destruction of the impious who are then to perish.

"New heavens, however, and a new earth, we, according to his promise, look for, in which righteousness dwells," and which therefore, the implication is, are never to be made engines of destruction, as men are never again to become impious.

Such is indubitably the philological meaning of this passage; the simple, full, and only sense it will bear. Not a hue of the pencil, in the explication we have given of it, is either raised a shade above, or depressed below the color of the original. And not a trace appears in it of the universal conflagration, dissolution, and annihilation of the earth and atmosphere, which commentators generally have supposed it to foreshow. The notion of such a catastrophe has no just foundation in the passage, and has sprung entirely from a misconception of the import of the terms, a consequent misjudgment of the phenomena which they describe, and a neglect to consider the incompatibility of a general conflagration and dissolution of all things with the descriptions that are given in other parts of the sacred word, of the same event.

This will be made still more apparent by a consideration of the nature and grounds of the construction that is ordinarily put on it. By most it is regarded as wholly incompatible with the survivance of any portion of mankind in the natural life; and by others as at least rendering the supposition of their survivance extremely difficult. It results, however, from their forming conceptions of the catastrophe,

and of the class of persons whom it is to destroy, which the language does not warrant.

Thus, one class of commentators interpret the term "heavens," as denoting the celestial orbs, the moon, planets, sun, and stars, and regard the prophecy as announcing the conflagration of the whole material universe. No fancy, however, could be more mistaken or absurd. The object of the fire is to be to destroy "the impious." It is to the judgment and destruction of the men who are ungodly, that the heavens and earth are reserved for fire. But how would the conflagration of the sun, the moon, and the planets, be necessary to that destruction, or in any manner contribute to it? And much more, how would the conflagration of all the other systems of worlds that fill the boundless realms of space, that have no physical connexion whatever with our system, be needful to that end? Do those persons suppose the ungodly men who are then to perish, are to be destroyed by the flames of the distant parts of the universe? If not, if they are to be destroyed by the fires of the earth, what need can there be of a more extensive conflagration? But the word *οὐρανοί*, the heavens, instead of the sun, moon, planets, and the starry spheres, denotes simply the atmosphere of the earth; the region of the air above us, in which "the fowls of heaven" fly, and "the clouds of heaven" float. This is clear, not only from the subject itself of the passage, but especially from the prediction that *οὐρανοί*, the heavens, shall pass away, or rush with a crash, or loud noise; which shows that the rush or rapid motion producing the crashing noise, is to be within the limits of our atmosphere, inasmuch as it is only within the region of the air that the motion of objects can produce a sound. To suppose that a rush of Jupiter, Saturn, and Herschel, from their orbits into space, would produce a crash which would be heard in our world, is to assume that the whole region through which the sound would pass, is filled by an element susceptible of vibration, like our atmosphere, which is contrary to fact. No such element exists in the space that surrounds our atmosphere, which, as far as has been determined by astronomers, extends only to a height of forty-five or fifty miles. Beyond that limit, as at the distance of the moon and planets, a body could no more produce a crashing vibra-

tion in our atmosphere by dashing through space, than it could by remaining stationary. The catastrophe, then, which the prophecy foreshows is unquestionably to be confined to our world.

Others regard the passage as foreshowing that the earth at least is to be completely consumed, or reduced to cinders, and perhaps struck from existence. They derive that impression probably from the expression in the common version, that, "the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." As a house, or other wooden structure, a forest, a field of grain, or any combustible matter, is said to be burned up when it is completely fired, divested of organization, and reduced to ashes, these persons suppose that the language implies that the *whole* earth is in like manner to be consumed by the fire, divested of all its organized structure, and converted, at least, into a mass of ruins, if not swept from existence. But this, the original does not warrant. All that the verb means is that the earth—that is the combustible things on its surface, in the scene where the catastrophe occurs, shall be set on fire and shall burn, as for example, in a volcanic explosion, when the burning lava fires and consumes the inflammable objects, immediately around, with which it comes in contact. In like manner, when a violent upheaval and agitation of the surface of the earth in a particular district is produced by interior fires, *the earth*, without limitation, is said to shake and quake, although the movement is confined to a narrow region and to its mere surface. So also *the earth* is said to be wrapped in darkness at night, although the darkness is confined to one hemisphere, while the other is basking in the full light of day; and it is predicted that at the destruction of the antichristian hosts, "*the mountains shall be melted with their blood*," Isaiah xxiv. 3, though those mountains only are meant which are to be the scene of their slaughter, and not all the mountains of the globe. That all that this language means is, that the inflammable matter on the surface of the earth will be set on fire and will burn, in the regions where the destruction of the ungodly is to take place, is shown still more clearly by the fact, hereafter to be adduced, that even the wicked themselves, who are to be destroyed by the flames, are not to be absolutely consumed, but are to remain in such a condition as to be devoured by the birds of the air, and to require a burial.

Others seem to suppose that the conflagration in the atmosphere is to be universal, and is to take place at the same time over the whole surface of the globe; and that the survival of any of its population must therefore be impossible. This notion, however, has no ground whatever in the passage. The prediction is simply that the atmosphere shall be kindled, and shall be let loose, and shall rush with a great noise. It is not said that the whole atmosphere of the globe is to be kindled and rush in that manner. The prophecy will be accomplished, if that takes place in the scene where the impious, who are to perish, are assembled. As the atmosphere is not combustible, and cannot be separated into its constituents and made inflammable, except by the application of heat, or some other chemical force separate from itself, it is apparent that the firing of the air, or filling the air with fire, must be produced—if wrought as it doubtless will be, by natural means—by the infusion into it of some combustible element, such as an inflammable gas, carbon, or sulphur. The fire by which that combustible element is to be inflamed and ejected into the air, is probably to be that which is to issue from the throne of God, Dan. vii. 9, 10; the flaming fire in which he is to be revealed when he comes to take vengeance on his enemies, Isaiah lxvi. 15, 16; 2 Thess. i. 7, 8. If then the inflammable element is to be introduced into the atmosphere at the time,—unless created at the moment, which will not be deemed likely, inasmuch as ample stores of combustibles exist in the earth itself,—what is so probable as that it will be disengaged from the earth at the time, by the earthquakes which are then to convulse the globe, Zech. xiv. 4, 5, Joel iii. 16, and the firing of the interior by the lightnings flashed from the divine presence, by which those earthquakes are to be generated and the mountains made to melt; which, it is predicted Ps. xcvi., are to take place at his coming to reign on the earth? “A fire goeth before him and burneth up his enemies round about. His lightnings enlightened the world; the earth saw and trembled. The hills melted like wax at the presence of the Lord, at the presence of the Lord of the whole earth.” But if that is to be the source of the inflammable materials with which the atmosphere is to be kindled, and the fusion of the earthy matter on which the volcanic fires



act, is to be the melting of the elements which the prediction foreshows, it is not to be supposed that it is to extend at once through the whole mass of the atmosphere around the whole globe. It will naturally, and without a miracle necessarily, be confined to the regions immediately round the scenes of the earthquakes and volcanic fires, and thence to the portions of the atmosphere over the regions in which the ungodly men are assembled, whom its office is to destroy. And such a firing of the earth, and conflagration of the air, in those regions in which great numbers of the antichristian party live and are to be assembled, will fully equal the import of the prediction, and form an ample verification of it. This view will be rendered still more indubitable by considerations hereafter to be adduced.

If it is held that the conflagration, instead of being produced by natural means, is to be the work exclusively of a miracle, then no explanation of the exemption of the nations who are living on the earth is necessary; inasmuch as if the conflagration is altogether miraculous, the exemption of the nations is just as consistent with the miracle as their destruction would be. The whole supposition that the living population of the globe are to perish by the conflagration, proceeds on the assumption that the fire is to act according to the laws of nature. If therefore the laws of nature have no place in it, but it is to be the mere work of the divine volition, the preservation of the nations is just as consistent with it as their destruction can be. To maintain, accordingly, that the burning of the atmosphere must naturally destroy the inhabitants of the earth, is to maintain that the fire is to act according to the natural and invariable laws of that element; and that implies that it is to be produced by natural means; that is, by the inflammation of naturally combustible matter. That, however, as necessarily implies that those means are to be drawn from the earth itself, in which inflammable matter exists in ample quantity: for why should it be supposed that God will create combustible elements to fire the earth, when such elements already exist in the earth itself, and only need the application of fire to kindle and explode them into the atmosphere? But the supposition that they are to be drawn from the earth itself implies that they are to be developed

and emitted into the atmosphere only in certain regions and in limited quantities; for that results necessarily from the partial distribution of those elements, and their agency as far as it has hitherto been exemplified; and thence it follows that the conflagration, instead of being universal at the same moment, is to be confined to limited regions; and as will hereafter appear, is to take place in those regions successively.

Others assume that none of the unsanctified are to escape that conflagration, from the fact that it is designed to destroy "the men that are impious." That term, however, *οἱ ἀσεβεῖς*, the impious, is used, there is the most ample certainty, not to designate the unsanctified generally and promiscuously, but only the open, organized, and peculiarly guilty enemies of Christ, who are directly opposing his kingdom, or at least giving their sympathy and concurrence to its opposers. For they are in several prophecies expressly designated as the parties who are to be destroyed by fire at Christ's coming. Thus the ten-horned beast, that is to be slain at the judgment at which the Ancient of Days is to preside, is the symbol of the kings and subordinate rulers of the fourth great monarchy; and it is they only whose destruction is symbolized by its death and the giving of its body to the burning flame. That the subjects of that empire are promiscuously to perish along with the rulers denoted by the beast, not a hint is given in the vision; nor is the supposition compatible with the revelation which it makes of the catastrophe of the monarchs, the false prophet symbolized by the eleventh horn, and their subordinates in the governments of which they are the heads. If the people are to perish along with the governments, how is it that they appear as symbols in the vision which immediately follows of the investiture of Christ with the dominion of the earth, and it is announced that they, who are most certainly included in "all people, nations, and languages," are to "serve him," and throughout his reign which is to continue for ever and ever?

In like manner at the great battle of Armageddon, it is the ten-horned beast, and the false prophet or head of the papacy alone, that are to be cast alive into the lake of fire and brimstone; and the kings and armies that are to be associated with them alone that are to be slain. No intimation is given that the population of the realms over which those

monarchs and priests reign, are to perish along with them. So also in the vision of the great image, Dan. ii., as it is the image alone that is dashed to powder by the stone cut out of the mountain, and blown away by the wind like chaff from the threshers, so it is the chief rulers and their subordinates alone who belong to the organized bodies that exercise the governments and are symbolized by the image, whose destruction is foreshown by the crushing of the image. In the prediction of the same great event also, Isaiah lvi. 15-24, while it is foreshown that the Lord will plead with all flesh, and that the slain of the Lord shall be many, and that those especially are to perish who are open idolaters; it is yet announced that he will gather all nations and tongues, and they shall come and see his glory, and he will set a sign among them, and those of them that escape, he will send to the nations at a distance that have not heard his fame nor seen his glory, and that they shall assist the return of the Israelites to their land, and shall afterwards come there to offer worship,—which indicates that the destruction is to be confined to the open and incorrigible enemies of Christ. The nations at large are to survive. In like manner the prediction of the great battle at Jerusalem, Zech. xiv., exhibits the destruction which is then to take place, as confined to the armies that are arrayed against that city, and endeavoring to prevent the establishment there of Christ's throne. For those alone who are to perish are "the people that have fought against Jerusalem." The remainder of the nations to whom those "people" belonged, are expressly represented as surviving and going up "from year to year" to Jerusalem "to worship the king, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles." What can more clearly show that the destruction is to be limited to the armed hosts that are to be engaged in open war against Christ?

But that the phrase "the ungodly men," "the men that are impious," against whose judgment and perdition the burning of the atmosphere and earth is reserved, denotes the open, organized, and incorrigible enemies of Christ and his kingdom, who are engaged in an attempt to defeat him, and prevent the verification of his word, is seen from the passage 2 Thess. i. 8, 9, to which our correspondent refers,

as parallel to 2 Peter iii. 4. For those then to perish who are described v. 8, as not knowing God, and not obeying the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, are to be of the same class, it is indicated, as those v. 6, who had persecuted the Thessalonian believers. "Your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations that ye endure," are "a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God in counting you worthy of the kingdom of God for which ye suffer: since it is righteous with God to recompense tribulation to those who trouble you" by persecution; "and to you who are afflicted, rest with us at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." As the patience and faith of the believers under persecution are to be the reason of their acceptance and reward when Christ comes in flaming fire, so, the representation is, the disowning of God, and rejection of the gospel, *manifested in the persecution of the saints*, are to be the reason of the destruction of those who are to perish by the fire. For it is the persecutors τοῖς θλιβουσιν ὑμᾶς, those who afflict you, it is expressly said, whom God is then to repay by affliction.

That the terms, "the men that are impious," against whose judgment and ἀπωλείας, perdition, the firing of the air and earth is reserved, are thus used to designate the openly apostate and persecuting enemies of Christ's kingdom, not the unrenewed promiscuously, is confirmed also by the denomination in the next chapter, 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4, of the great combination of false and persecuting teachers of the Catholic church, "the man of sin," the son of ἀπωλείας perdition, and the antagonist and rival of all that is called God or entitled to homage; and the announcement that it is the party which he represents, who are to be consumed by the breath of Christ's mouth, and destroyed by the effulgence, that is the flaming fire of his advent. They are further described as a body in whom the inworking of Satan appears with all power and signs and lying miracles, and all the deceit or falsehood of unrighteousness. They are to be persons, therefore, who profess to act with divine authority, and to work miracles in proof of their commission and the truth of their doctrines; but whose miracles are to

be false, and their show of piety a mere deceit or counterfeit by unrighteousness. They are to be false religious teachers, therefore, counterfeit disciples and ministers of Christ, who usurp his name, authority, and throne. As these are the class denominated the man of sin and son of perdition, who are then to perish by the fire of Christ's presence, and as no intimation is given that any others living in the same scenes are to be involved in that catastrophe, it indicates that Peter's phrase, "the ungodly men," "the men that are impious," who are to perish at the same juncture, is used also to denote only the same class of open and organized enemies to Christ's kingdom.

This is corroborated also by the parable of the field sown with good seed, in which the owner symbolizes Christ, and the wheat and tares those who professedly live under his rule; the wheat representing the true believers whom Christ introduces into his kingdom, but the tares denoting the wicked, whom Satan introduces among Christ's true disciples, by leading them to profess his name, and assume the badge of his followers; and it is these alone who are to be gathered by the angels out of his kingdom at his coming, and consigned to the furnace of fire. These may include some, not improbably, who are not open apostates and persecutors; but it indicates that the destruction is to be confined to the special agents and vassals of Satan, whose aim and office is to pervert and destroy the kingdom of the Redeemer.

In like manner those, in the judgment of the living, fore-shown Matt. xxv. 31-46, who are to be placed at the left hand of the judge, and consigned to everlasting punishment, are exhibited as consisting solely of those who have acted in a direct relation to Christ's true people in the great persecution which is immediately to precede his coming, and as having either taken an open part with the persecutors, or shown a concurrence with them by refusing all succor to the persecuted in their sufferings. The representation assumes that they were all in a condition, if they had had a disposition to it, to have relieved the sufferers, not only by giving food, clothing, shelter, and medicine, to those who were at large and might be approached without obstruction, but to those also who were confined in prison; and that they took

the side therefore, and in their sphere acted the part of persecutors, as really as those in official stations by whom the persecution was originated and carried on. They are probably different persons from those who are to perish at Armageddon; but are of the same general class, the open and merciless enemies of Christ's true people.

These various descriptions of the parties who are then to be destroyed, all of which exhibit them as open, organized apostates, and relentless enemies of God, not the unsanctified generally, make it clear that it is the antichristian, idolatrous, and persecuting host alone, that is then to perish by the fires of the divine vengeance, not the unrenewed nations generally of the earth.

That the fire that is to destroy "the impious men" is not to consume the whole earth and reduce it to a wreck, is decisively shown, moreover, by the fact that it is not even to burn up the bodies of the antichristian host generally that is to perish at that crisis, but they are to remain unconsumed, to be devoured by the birds of the air, and in many instances to require burial. Thus at the great battle of God at Armageddon, where the armies of the kings who are to co-operate with the wild beast are to be slain by the sword, or breath proceeding from the mouth of Christ, the fowls of heaven are summoned to gather themselves together to the supper of the great God, that they may eat "the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all, both free and bond, both small and great." "And the beast and the false prophet that wrought miracles before it, were taken and cast alive into the lake of fire burning with brimstone; the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which proceeded out of his mouth, and all the fowls were filled with their flesh," Rev. xix. 17-21, which indicates that they were merely killed by the flaming breath of the Redeemer, not devoured by it, nor by any conflagration of the atmosphere or earth that was kindled by it, or by any other cause. For why should the fowls have been invited to sup on them, if they were wrapped in a devouring fire and consumed by it? And how, if they were dispatched in that way, could all the fowls, or any of them, have been filled by their flesh?

In like manner Gog, who is to invade the land of Israel, after the Israelites have returned and resettled there, and whom God is to destroy by raining upon him and upon his bands, and upon the many people that are with him, an overflowing rain, and great hailstones, fire, and brimstone, is to be given unto the ravenous birds of every sort, and to the beasts of the field to be devoured; and their bows and arrows are to remain and serve as fuel for the Israelites for seven years, and their bones are to lie on the surface, and in such numbers and scattered over so wide a region, as to require seven months to complete their burial, *Ezek. xxxviii, xxxix*. Can a stronger proof be imagined, that though they are in a measure to be killed by the fire and brimstone showered on them, they yet are not to be burned and reduced to ashes by it, or by a general conflagration? If they are to perish by a general conflagration, how could their bodies remain to be devoured by ravenous birds and wild beasts? How, if the whole atmosphere is then inflamed and annihilated, and the whole earth fused and consumed by the heat, can the birds and beasts survive to feed on their carcases? Or how could their bows, arrows, spears, and other combustible armor, escape the burning, and serve for fuel to the Israelites? How indeed could the Israelites themselves any more escape destruction by such a universal fire? Can anything be more clear, than that the whole fancy of such an all-devouring conflagration is without authority, and irreconcilable with the predictions of the catastrophe by which "the impious" are to perish at that crisis? Or can any clearer indication be necessary, than is presented in this prophecy, that the fire and brimstone that are to be rained upon Gog and his armies, though kindled probably by the lightnings flashed from the throne of the Almighty, are yet to proceed from the volcanoes with which Palestine is then to be fired and convulsed? For the great earthquake with which it is predicted the land of Israel is then to be shaken, is doubtless to proceed from the explosion of combustible matter beneath the surface, that is to vent itself by the projection of its burning gases and heated minerals into the atmosphere, and produce the conflagration of the air and fusion of the elements, which it is foreshown by Peter are to take place "in that day" "of the Lord." "For in my jealousy, and in the fire

of my wrath have I spoken; Surely in that day there shall be a great shaking in the land of Israel; so that the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the heaven, and the beasts of the field, and all creeping things that creep upon the earth, and all the men that are upon the face of the earth, shall shake *at my presence*; and the mountains shall be thrown down, and the steep places shall fall, and every wall shall fall to the ground, Ezek. xxxviii. 19, 20. A great earthquake is to take place, therefore, at the time of the rain of the fire and brimstone on Gog and his hosts; and as such violent convulsions of the earth usually, and probably in all instances, issue in volcanic eruptions, in which sulphur is a leading element, what is so probable as that the fire and brimstone with which the invading hosts are to be overwhelmed, are to be projected from the kindled earth into the atmosphere, and by emitting a vast volume of inflammable gas along with them, fill the heavens to a great height with flame, and in the rushing whirlwinds and crashing noise which usually attend the explosions of great volcanoes, verify the prediction that the heavens or atmosphere shall rush with a loud roar, or thundering noise? The phenomena described by the apostle are precisely such as attend the eruption of the great volcano, Kilauea Hawaii, as described in passages quoted in the Journal, vol. v. pp. 189, 190, and 369, from which we transcribe the following sentences. "The stream plunged into the sea with loud detonations. The burning lava, on meeting the waters, was shivered like melted glass into millions of particles which were thrown up in clouds that darkened the sky, and fell like a storm of hail over the surrounding country. Vast columns of steam and vapors rolled off before the wind, whirling in ceaseless agitation, and the reflected glare of the lavas formed a fiery firmament overhead."—Dana's Geol. U. S. Expl. Expedition, pp. 188–192.

"The intense heat of the fountain and stream of lava caused an influx of cool air from every quarter. This created *terrific whirlwinds*, which constantly stalking about, like so many sentinels, bade defiance to [he means threatened] the daring visitor. These were the most dangerous of anything about the volcano. Clouds approaching the volcano were driven back, and set moving in wild confusion."—Letter of H. Kinney, Am. Jour. of Science, Sept. 1852, p. 258.



As, then, volcanic phenomena,—the filling the sky with flames, the whirlwind rush of the air, a loud roar and crash, and the fusion of the earthy elements projected from the crater, and decomposition of the water and air with which they come in contact,—thus accord precisely with those described by the apostle as to attend the judgment and destruction of “the impious men;” why should it not be held as clear that the firing of the air and earth, and melting of the elements, which he foreshows, are to be of precisely the same kind, and proceed from the same cause? The language he employs is not stronger, the effects he describes are not of a more intense nature, than those depicted in these passages.

It is predicted also, Isaiah lxvi. 24, that there are to be carcases of men, who are to be slain at that epoch, that not only are not to be consumed by the fire, but are to remain visible at least for a time, and it would seem from the description, in a volcanic locality; and are to be gazed at by survivors. “And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord: and they shall go forth and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.”

This view of the catastrophe is corroborated by the description given by Zechariah of the mode in which the anti-christian hosts are then to be destroyed. “And this shall be the plague wherewith the Lord will smite all the people that have fought against Jerusalem. Their flesh shall consume away while they stand upon their feet, and their eyes shall consume away in their sockets, and their tongue shall consume away in their mouth.” “And so shall be the plague of the horse, of the mule, of the camel, and of the ass, and of all the beasts that shall be in their tents, as this plague.”—Chap. xiv. 12, 15.

This is not the effect that would naturally be produced, if they were absolutely enveloped in a devouring fire, as they then could not remain on their feet, nor would one part of their bodies be more exposed to injury than another; but it is precisely the effect that would be produced by a volcanic

eruption, sending up vast volumes of melted lava and burning gases into the heights of the atmosphere, that should reflect an intense heat and glare on the eyes, and generate hot gusts and whirlwinds loaded with heated particles that should rush in all directions, and filling the eyes, mouths, and clothes of the hosts every few moments, excite inflammation, and soon destroy the parts most exposed, while the sufferers would still be able to remain on their feet.

It is corroborated also by the prediction, that instead of being instantly destroyed by the fire, they are to be thrown into a tumult, and in their confusion and terror are to fall on each other. "And it shall come to pass in that day, a great tumult from the Lord shall be among them; and they shall lay hold every one on the hand of his neighbor, and his hand shall rise up against the hand of his neighbor," Zech. xiv. 13. This might naturally arise from a volcanic eruption, that, threatening them with destruction, should prompt them to fly in haste and disarray, and, blinding them with ashes and smoke, should prevent them from distinguishing each other. In such a flight they would naturally run against each other, and not improbably mistake one another for foes, and each endeavor to effect his escape by sacrificing whoever stood in his way. But no such tumult and conflict could occur were they instantly enveloped in an atmosphere of devouring fire. Flight would then be impossible. Each would instantly sink overpowered by his sufferings, and have neither motive nor strength to contend with his neighbor. Who ever heard of persons enveloped in the flames of a burning building fighting with each other, or can conceive it possible?

This accords also with the prediction, Psalm xi. 6. "The wicked," the impious, are defined, v. 2, as those who plot the destruction of the righteous. "For lo, the wicked bend their bow, they make ready their arrow upon the string, that they may privily shoot at the upright in heart." "The Lord is in his holy temple; the Lord's throne is in heaven; his eyes behold, his eyelids try the children of men. The Lord trieth the righteous; but the wicked, and him that loveth violence, his soul hateth." And these he is to destroy by a storm like those which are often generated by volcanic eruptions. "Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and

brimstone, and an horrible tempest: the portion of their cup."

These considerations make it clear that the catastrophe which the apostle foreshows, instead of a universal conflagration of the atmosphere and the earth, that is to blot them from existence, or reduce them to a mass of ruins, is to be but a local and partial firing of the earth and air, that is to be the means of terror, confusion, and death to the impious hosts and their co-operators who are arrayed in open war against Christ; not of destroying the nations of the earth at large.

And finally, this is confirmed by the events that are to intervene between the coming of Christ in the clouds, and the completion of the judgment of the living nations, which show not only that no general conflagration of the world is to take place on his arrival, but that the destruction of the impious, who are to perish by his avenging fires, instead of being accomplished in a single catastrophe, is to take place successively, and in different scenes. There are many who seem to suppose that the world will be set on fire and the wicked universally destroyed, immediately on Christ's arrival. But that notion is both wholly unfounded, and inconsistent with many events that are to attend and follow his advent.

Thus it is apparent that his advent itself, or first appearance, cannot be beheld by all the inhabitants of the globe at the same time; since whatever the direction may be in which he approaches it, he can only be visible at the same moment to the people of one hemisphere, and if perceptible at a great distance, cannot, unless he passes round the earth, or there is an acceleration of its rotation on its axis, under twelve hours after, be seen by all the residents in the other hemisphere; while if he is not visible till he reaches the atmosphere, and the region of clouds, he will be seen at the same time by the population of only a narrow region.

But his avenging lightnings are not to be darted on his enemies and kindle the earth and atmosphere, even at the great battle with his armed foes, the instant of his becoming visible. His foes, instead of being immediately enveloped in fire and devoured, are to flee to the mountains and

crag, and endeavor to hide themselves from his wrath. "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens, and in the rocks of the mountains, and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath has come, and who shall be able to stand." Rev. vi. 15-17. The same terror, flight, and attempt to secrete themselves are predicted by Isaiah ii. 10-21. "Enter into the rock, and hide thee in the dark, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty. The lofty looks of men shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. For the day of the Lord of hosts shall be upon every one that is *proud and lofty*, and upon every one that is *lifted up*; and he shall be brought low; and upon all the cedars of Lebanon high and lifted up, and upon all the oaks of Bashan; and upon all the high mountains, and upon all the hills that are lifted up, and upon every high tower, and upon every fenced wall, and upon all the ships of Tarshish, and upon all the pleasant pictures. And *the loftiness* of man shall be bowed down, and *the haughtiness* of men shall be made low; and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. And the idols shall be utterly abolished. And they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth. In that day shall a man cast his idols of silver and his idols of gold, which they made each one for himself to worship, to the moles and to the bats, to go into the clefts of the rocks, and into the tops of the ragged rocks, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth." This indicates that the vengeance of God is then to be especially directed against *the haughty and daring in sin*, and that a terrible earthquake is to be one means by which it is to be executed; but it shows that the guilty are not to be instantaneously destroyed, but are to have opportunity to flee to the mountains, and hide themselves in dens and caverns. The event foreshown in these passages is doubt-

less the battle of Armageddon, when the usurping and persecuting powers denoted by the wild beast, the false prophet, and their armies, are to be destroyed. A still longer period is to intervene between Christ's advent, and the judgment of the living nations, described Matt. xxv. 31-46; for they are to be gathered together after his coming, and not, as is generally supposed, at the same time and place, but there is every reason to presume successively. It is after he has come in the clouds of heaven, he himself announces, Matt. xxiv. 31, that he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet to gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other; and it is still later, it is indicated in the vision of the vintage, Rev. xiv. 17-20, that the wicked are to be gathered and destroyed; and probably neither of these classes is to be assembled at one time and in one place. The language does not imply it. The representation will be perfectly verified by the assembling of the nations before him, though it be in different scenes and successively. And why should the population of Europe, Africa, America, and the Pacific and Indian isles, be transported to Asia to be judged?—a process that unless accomplished by a miracle would occupy many years, more indeed far than an ordinary lifetime even of the aged, and demand extraordinary provisions for the subsistence and shelter of those collected at the scene, while the gathering was in progress. Such a voyage and march of nine hundred millions of human beings to a single point on the globe, would involve, in truth, an array of miracles, compared with which all that have hitherto been wrought in the government of the world would sink into insignificance; and is not to be thought of. The judgment of the nations will doubtless take place in their several territories, and in succession. A considerable period therefore, and not impossibly years, may pass ere it is completed. The supposition, accordingly, that the earth and atmosphere are to be fired throughout and utterly consumed as the process proceeds, is contradictory and absurd.

It is equally inconsistent with the resurrection of the unholy from the grave and the sea at the distance of the vast series of ages denoted by the thousand years after Christ's advent, and the resurrection of the righteous, and the de-

struction of the antichristian hosts. It is expressly revealed in the vision of the resurrection of the holy dead at the commencement of the thousand years, that "the rest of the dead are not to live again until the thousand years are finished;" and there is immediately after a vision of their resurrection from the sea, the grave, and the realms of the unburied, and their judgment soon after the close of the thousand years. But their resurrection at that late period, after Christ's coming and destruction of the impious hosts, symbolized by the beast, Babylon, the false prophet, and their confederates, shows that the earth and air cannot in the mean time have been reduced to a mass of ruins by a conflagration, and the sea evaporated or struck from existence; as then, to make it possible, it would be necessary that the earth and sea should be restored from their dissolution to essentially the state in which they subsisted before their destruction; for how can the grave and the sea at that epoch give up the dead that are in them, if there are no graves, nor sea, in which the dead are buried? But who will venture to maintain that the earth and the sea are to be reproduced from non-existence, in their original state, and that the dead they once contained are to be redeposited in them, in order to their resurrection in the manner represented in that vision?

Such are the stupendous contradictions and absurdities which the notion of the conflagration and dissolution of the world at Christ's coming involves. It not only has no authority whatever in the passage from which it has been drawn, and no countenance from any other part of the Word of God, but it is entirely inconsistent with the views which are presented in the prophets of the events that are to attend and follow Christ's coming, destruction of the impious, judgment of the living population of the world, and reign over the nations through the ages that are to follow.

It is not the millenarian, therefore, but the anti-millenarian, whose views it is impossible to reconcile with the apostle's language, and the teachings generally of the Scriptures on this subject.

On the whole, then, the notion almost universally entertained of the conflagration and dissolution of the heavens and earth at Christ's coming, is without any ground whatever in the apostle's words, and springs wholly from attach-

ing to them a meaning which they do not involve. The fires by which the impious are then to be destroyed, are to be but local and temporary, and are to offer, there is reason to believe, no more obstacle to the safety of the population of the globe at large, than the volcanoes have that have already raged in the depths of the earth, and ejected their burning elements into the atmosphere.

### III. THE JUDGMENT. MATTHEW XXV. 31-46; REVELATION XX. 4-15.

There is no inconsistency, that we perceive, between the judgments predicted in these passages; as that foreshown in Matthew is a judgment of the living nations, but those foreshown in the Revelation, judgments of the holy and unholy dead. *Πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, Matt. xxv. 32, denotes, as is shown in the Journal, vol. iv., pp. 164, 165, all the living nations, and the living exclusively, never the dead. The prediction that they are to be judged by themselves involves, therefore, no inconsistency with the prediction, Rev. xx. 4-6, that the holy dead are also to be judged by themselves at the commencement of the thousand years; nor with the prediction, v. 11-15, that the unholy dead are to be judged by themselves after the close of the thousand years. And those predictions of the separate judgment of those classes are perfectly consistent with such passages as Psalm xcvi. 9, Acts xvii. 31, which declare that God shall judge the world in righteousness; as they simply announce the certainty that it is to be judged by him, without indicating whether the judgment of all is to take place at the same time, or not. Even the prediction, Matthew xxv. 31-46, does not imply, we take it, that all the living nations are to be gathered together in one place, and judged at one time. It merely announces that all are to be gathered before Christ and judged. If they are gathered and judged separately, it will be as literal and perfect a fulfilment of the prophecy as though they were assembled and judged at one place and time. The fact that there is no express intimation in the passage that they are to be gathered into more than one assembly, and judged at more than one time, is no more proof that there is to be but

one assembly and judgment, than the fact that in the parable of the sower but one person is exhibited as sowing the seed, implies that the sower represented but one person, who was to preach the word denoted by the seed. It is not credible, indeed, as we have already shown, that the living nations should all be gathered together at one place. First, because those only are represented as there to be judged who have acted in a direct relation to Christ's suffering followers, and shown thereby what their dispositions are towards him. And next, because the assembling of those two classes would necessarily involve probably the assembling of a large share of the others; for how could the young and helpless be deserted by their parents and others on whom they are dependent? But the assembling of one-half, one-third, or one-fourth, of the population of the globe in one place, may justly be regarded as physically impossible without a miracle, and a series of miracles, indeed, both to transport them across continents and seas, and furnish them with sustenance and shelter. All the present shipping of the world multiplied ten-fold, would not be adequate to carry two hundred millions of human beings, with the food and merchandise that would be essential to their sustenance and comfort, from the different parts of the world to the eastern end of the Mediterranean, or the Red Sea, in the lapse of half a century. And, besides, who would raise the surplus food and produce the surplus manufactures that would be needed to feed and clothe the hosts and the millions employed in their transportation, while their migration was in progress? Or, were it practicable, what great end could be answered by such a measure? So laborious and cumbrous a movement does not seem in accordance with the wisdom and goodness of God; and as it is not requisite to the literal accomplishment of the prediction, it is not to be supposed that it is to take place. The nations are doubtless to be assembled and judged separately and successively; and their judgment in that manner will involve no inconsistency with the judgment of the holy dead at the commencement of the thousand years, and of the unholy at the close of that period.



## ART. VIII.—THE WAR OF THE GREAT NATIONS.

THE eyes of the civilized world are fixed at present on the strife, on a rocky promontory of the Euxine, of four of the principal nations of the earth: the greatest of the Greek, the greatest of the Catholic, the greatest of the Protestant communion, and the most powerful also of the Mahometan faith. The immediate object of the contest at its present stage, is the possession of a few square miles of precipitous ridges and barren rocks. The ultimate object of Russia is, the conquest of the Turkish empire, supremacy in the Mediterranean, and a controlling influence in the politics of the nations of western Europe. The aim of Great Britain and France is to prevent Russia from making an accession to her territory and power, so vast and commanding, as not only to exclude them, if she chooses, from the Mediterranean, and endanger the East, but to threaten the independence of Italy and Germany, and menace their own existence. The object of Turkey is to protect herself from annihilation. It is a war therefore of the greatest interest to these nations, and whatever may be its issue, is to affect in a very important manner the well-being of the world. The aim of the Most High in permitting it doubtless is that these races may be the instruments of inflicting his justice on each other, and that the universe may see that men are still the same as they have ever been; not only revolters from him, but enemies of one another, and ready for the gratification of their cruel passions, an empty shout of applause, or the momentary possession of power and wealth, to pursue each other with a merciless vengeance, and hurl myriads and millions down the precipice of eternal destruction. Their progress in the arts, their higher knowledge, their large enjoyment of the comforts of life, the long reign of Christianity among them, have not wrought any change in their principles or passions: even the nations that are disposed to peace, are forced to war to defend themselves from their lawless and malignant neighbors, who threaten them with encroachment and *vas-salage*.

A series of events that have preceded this contest, and

apparently been conditions of its occurrence, have been as peculiar and as unexpected, as the war itself. Such, especially, was the fall of the French monarchy in 1848, and the institution of a far more energetic and commanding government in its place. Had Louis Philippe continued to occupy the French throne till his death, and then transmitted it to his heir, the young Duke of Orleans, it is not likely that the regency in whose hands the government would now have been, would have ventured on so hazardous a conflict. Nor is it likely, had not the disasters of that period placed Austria in a condition of dependence on Russia, and made peace with that power essential to her security, that the Czar himself would have entered on the system of unjust and presumptuous measures that led to the war. He undoubtedly calculated, and perhaps still calculates at least, on the neutrality of that empire, and not improbably looks even for her co-operation, should it be necessary, to shield him from a final defeat. The short crops of 1853 were an element also in the combination of events, which prompted the emperor Nicholas to select the moment to carry into effect his schemes for extending his sway over Turkey. He flattered himself, probably, that the fear of being cut off from their usual supplies of grain from the Baltic and Euxine, would withhold the English and French from interfering by force to prevent him from accomplishing his ambitious designs. And finally, another event still more extraordinary, and essential perhaps to the possibility of the war, was the discovery of gold in California and Australia, by which the capital of England and France, and the means of supporting the public credit, have been so vastly augmented, that no serious difficulties are felt or anticipated in providing resources for the contest. The casual notice by a laborer, of a few brilliant particles glittering on a sand-bank in the morning sun, was an essential element in the combination of causes that were to determine the present movements of these great empires, and that are to exert the most decisive influences on the destinies of the world. Had it not been for the accession of several hundred millions from those sources to the specie of Europe, and the assurance of its continued augmentation on an undiminished scale, the prospect of such a war would probably have given a shock to public credit, which neither the cabi-

net of Great Britain nor France would have found it possible to overcome.

The war has not only resulted from a peculiar concurrence of events, but has forced its way as it were, into existence, against the most strenuous efforts to avoid it. Great Britain, France, and Turkey, instead of having eagerly rushed into or courted it, have striven by all the artifices of diplomacy, and by generous concessions, to avert it; and have only assumed the sword when forced to the alternative either of checking the ambition of Russia, or yielding themselves the unresisting victims of her power.

The issues of the contest are to be of the utmost moment, also, whichever side may gain the final victory. The results indeed already made sure, are of the greatest significance, and form an essential link apparently in the series of events, that are to lead on to the accomplishment of the predicted judgments and catastrophes of the nations. Had Russia been allowed to carry out her project of aggression without obstruction, she would probably in a very brief period have drawn the whole Turkish empire within her grasp. The Czar's pretence that his aim in seizing the Principalities was merely to withhold the Sultan from some meditated violation of the rights of the professors of the Greek faith in his dominions, and that he had no designs of conquest or further encroachment, is entitled to no credence. As soon as he had ascertained that he was to meet no resistance from the courts of London and Paris, he would have doubled his forces in the Principalities, crossed the Danube, cut his way to Constantinople, and swept the Turkish dynasty to the grave, or driven it into Asia Minor or Syria. It were absurd to suppose that he would have lost so propitious a moment to consummate his schemes, and left the prey but half gorged, and liable by a later interference of England or France to be snatched from his grasp.

The extinction of the Turkish empire, however, at this point in the current of events, is inconsistent with the great scheme of Providence which is revealed in the Scriptures, and would contradict the predictions that are made of the period and circumstances of its fall. The Turkish power, it is generally held by interpreters, is that which is symbolized under the sixth trumpet, by the monster horseman from the

east of the Euphrates, whose office it was to scourge and torture the idolatrous churches, especially of the eastern Roman empire. But it is expressly foreshown that they are to continue their sway till the slaying of the witnesses at the close of the period denoted by the twelve hundred and sixty days, immediately before the seventh trumpet, the coming of Christ, the resurrection of the holy dead, and the judgment of the nations, Rev. xi. 14-19. As therefore the witnesses have not yet been slain, the fall of the Turkish empire at this time is inconsistent with that prediction.

This war against the Czar, accordingly, is to defeat his scheme of an immediate conquest of Turkey, and is an indispensable element in the great current of causes that are, on the one hand, to prevent the confutation of the prophecy by a premature fall of that empire, and, on the other, are to secure its overthrow at the epoch which the prediction assigns for its fall. And this, or the postponement at least of the Czar's schemes for a considerable period, the events of the contest have already made sure. Whatever may be its final issue, the repulse of the Russians from the Danube, and the destruction of their fleet, make it certain that a considerable time must pass after peace shall have been concluded, ere the Czar can make another movement for the conquest of Constantinople, with a prospect of success. Should Sebastopol and the Crimea be conquered by the allies, and remain in their hands, or be transferred to Turkey, as they will have control of the Black Sea, a series of years must revolve before Russia can again construct such a fleet as will be essential to a war on the Sultan, even should he be left without assistance from the western powers. Should Sebastopol and the Crimea remain in the hands of the Czar, at least six, eight, or ten years must intervene before he can reconstruct his dilapidated fortresses, and rebuild his armaments, so as to put himself in as favorable an attitude as he was at the commencement of this struggle, for the accomplishment of his purpose. The war is undoubtedly, therefore, filling a most important office in the great tragedy of Providence.

Ere it terminates, however, events of a far different and more stirring interest may occur, that shall change the whole condition of the western nations, and occupy an equally im-

portant place in the great succession that is to lead on to the catastrophe to which they are rapidly advancing. The apprehension is felt by many in Great Britain, and on the continent, that ere the contest is closed, it may be transferred to the west of Europe, by a coalition betwixt Prussia, and perhaps Austria, and Russia, by insurrection or other causes, and may end in a revolution in those countries and Italy, and the institution of new governments on the basis of general suffrage. That would invest it with immeasurably greater importance than it seems now to possess, and make it the precursor of the persecution of the witnesses, which is to follow the assumption by the civil rulers of their last form, as represented by the eighth king of the empire, and the ten kings that are to have one mind with him, and give to him their power, Rev. xvii. 10-14. Whether, however, it is to be so closely connected or not with that modification of the western governments—which, it seems to have become the general belief, is rapidly approaching—it is doubtless one of the great and essential steps in the train that is to lead to the accomplishment of the revelations God has made, and belongs to the system of judgments denominated by the Spirit of inspiration, the last plagues, the infliction of which began upwards of sixty years ago, and is far advanced towards its completion. It has already proved a direful calamity to vast crowds. Out of the armies and fleets engaged in the conflict, probably not less than one hundred thousand have fallen in battle, been swept away by the pestilence, or perished from fatigue. And who can estimate the alarms, the miseries, the outrages, to which the Principalities have been subjected by the savage hosts that have overrun and pillaged them? Who can sum up the sorrows by which multitudes have been smitten by the wholesale carnage of the battles in the Crimea? Or who can picture in imagination the amount of toil and deprivation to which millions are to be subjected, to pay the crushing expenses of the struggle? Contemplated in its mildest aspect, it is a gigantic calamity, and forms an awful expression of God's avenging justice. It is, accordingly, viewed with profound interest and awe by the Christian and Mahometan nations that are embarked in it, and with forebodings in myriads of hearts, that it is but the first gust of a tempest that is to rush

westward, and ere it sinks into silence, is to spread terror and devastation over the other kingdoms and nations of the European family.

This conflict, however, in which such momentous interests are involved, is not contemplated with awe by the inhabitants of this world alone. It is gazed at from the orbs above with a far profounder sense of the awful passions which it displays, and fuller comprehension of the ends it is to answer in the divine administration. It must strike the intelligences of those blissful spheres with a resistless sense of the folly, malignity, and madness of men, to see them gathering from the most distant regions—Northern Africa, the whole circuit of the ancient kingdoms of Babylonia, Media, and Greece, the most remote nations of the Roman empire in the west, and the vast regions of Northern Europe and Asia, in such crowds, and with such terrific engines, to harass each other with alarms, rend each other with wounds, and consign one another to the horrors of a premature and violent death. What a contrast the scene presents to their peaceful realms, which are never ravaged by evil passions, nor darkened by avenging frowns, because of sin? How clear must be their sight, and how full their realization, that man has fallen, and has become an enemy to himself, as well as God! And how resistlessly must the spectacle impress them with the feeling, that they are left of God thus to smite each other with misery and death, that they may, on the one hand, show forth to the universe their character as revolters from him; and on the other, make themselves the instruments of inflicting on one another his avenging justice? What lessons are the un-fallen worlds thus taught? What exemplifications are made to them of what the wickedness, strife, and misery are, to which they sink, who depart from God? What light is reflected on the work of redemption? And what beauty must invest the power, and grace, and skill, that raise the ransomed from such a depth of ruin, to spotlessness, wisdom, and benevolence; and are finally to free the world from the ravages of sin and death, and make it the dwelling-place of unsullied sanctitude and unmingled bliss?

This is not a matter of mere fancy or conjecture; but it

is specifically revealed in the Apocalypse, that the angelic orders—the messengers of God who bear his will to the distant realms of his empire, and execute his behests in worlds that are occupied by inferior ranks of intelligences—and the spirits of the holy dead of our race, are made acquainted with the great scheme of his administration over our world, and are spectators of the awful judgments and gracious deliverances of which it is the scene. Thus they were present at the opening of the Revelation, chap. iv. v., and sang ascriptions of right and worthiness to the Lamb to break the seals of the divine purposes, and make known to angels, the redeemed in heaven, and the inhabitants of the earth, the great events that were to mark his sway over men, till he comes to conquer his enemies, and bring all nations to submit to his sceptre. At the sound of the seventh trumpet, they gave thanks with loud voices that the time had come when he was to judge the hosts that were arrayed in war against him, and deliver and accept his saints. And again, at the fall of Babylon, they ascribed to him salvation, and honor, and glory, and celebrated the righteousness of the doom he had assigned to that malignant power, and summoned the surviving inhabitants of the earth to fear and praise God, and rejoice that the hour of the resurrection of his people from the grave had arrived: which indicate that they are aware at every stage of its progress, of the accomplishment of his purposes here, and feel an interest suitable to the loftiness of their natures, the greatness of their knowledge, and the intimacy of their relations to God, in both the wrathful and the gracious interpositions by which he is conducting the present dispensation to its close.

But in the vision of the fifteenth chapter of the Apocalypse, the hosts of the redeemed are exhibited as assembled in the divine presence, immediately before the effusion of the last plagues on the nations, and chanting the truth and justice of God in those inflictions, and the redemption of the world in which they are to issue.

“And I saw another sign in heaven, great and wonderful; seven angels having the seven last plagues; for in them the wrath of God is finished. And I saw as it were a glassy sea mingled with fire; and they who were victorious

from the wild beast, and from its image, and from the number of its name, standing on the glassy sea, having harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb; saying, Great and wonderful are thy works, O Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, king of the nations. Who shall not fear, O Lord, and glorify thy name; for it is alone holy; for all the nations shall come and worship before thee, because thy judgments have been manifested," chap. xv. 1-4.

The hosts of those who are redeemed during the sway of the antichristian powers, are thus presented as assembled in the divine presence immediately before the effusion of the last plagues, and celebrating the righteousness of God in that vast train of the most terrible judgments that have ever been inflicted on the nations. The relation in which those who are victorious from the wild beast and from its image, and from the number of its name, that is, its mark or badge, are used as symbols, is that of exact likeness, or as representatives, of those who are redeemed during the tyranny of the powers denoted by the beast and its image; inasmuch as there is no other class of beings whom they can symbolize. There are no others who have had a conflict with those apostate powers, and escaped victorious from their assaults. The vision, accordingly, shows that at the epoch when the outpouring of the last plagues was about to commence, there was in reality such an assembly in the divine presence of those who have maintained their allegiance to God against the wiles, menaces, and persecutions of those apostate powers; an adoring celebration of his truth and righteousness in all his administration during their sway, both over them and over his own children; and a raptured utterance of their assurance that the destroying judgments by which so many were soon to perish, should terminate in the conviction of all worlds and all individuals that he, and he alone, is infinitely holy; and in bringing all the surviving nations to submission to his rule. It implies, accordingly, that the spirits of the witnesses and martyrs of Christ, not only now enjoy a conscious and active existence, and are raised to an intelligence suitable to beings who are admitted to the immediate presence of God, but that they have an intimate knowledge of all the conduct of men towards him, and of his



dealings with them ; are apprised of the nature of the judgments that are to mark the close of the present dispensation ; and see with the clearest certainty, and feel with the profoundest realization, that all his ways are just and true, worthy of his boundless attributes, and suited in the highest measure to subserve the conversion of the world in which they are to result.

Let us suppose the heavens were opened, and the spectacle were presented to us, as it was beheld by the apostle, and consider what truths it would reveal, and what impressions it would make. Among the first and most emphatic would doubtless be the consciousness and activity of the redeemed in their present life, and the intimacy and beauty of their relations to God. Instead of being struck with insensibility, or consigned to some remote and twilight world, where, as some imagine, they have neither means of knowledge, occupation, nor the power of communicating with each other, they are raised to a higher range of faculties than they here enjoyed, possess an immeasurably larger and more comprehensive knowledge, and are admitted to the immediate presence of God.

The next impression, perhaps, would be their countless number. The glassy pavement on which they stood is said to be *as it were a sea*. It was not an ordinary court spread out in front of the temple, but a vast level, like an expanse of water stretching forward and on either hand as far, perhaps, as the eye could reach, and is, because of that resemblance, denominated a sea. And an area extending in that manner in front, and sweeping round in a wide circuit, was doubtless requisite to station the vast host. A smaller space, indeed, could scarcely be entitled to the name of sea. How immense then must have been the multitude who occupied it ! How beautiful and impressive is the revelation which the symbol thus makes of the countlessness of the myriads who have been redeemed during the ages of the beast's power ! Instead of a small number, a host which no one can count, have washed their robes during that period, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb, and gone up from this stormy life to the presence of God, where they are waiting till the great hour arrives of the completion of their redemption.

And they have "harps of God, and sing the song of Moses and the Lamb. Great and wonderful are thy works, O Lord God Almighty. Just and true are thy ways, King of the nations. Who shall not fear, O Lord, and glorify thy name; for it is alone holy; for all the nations shall come and worship before thee, because thy judgments are made manifest!" Could we hear that chant as it burst from their fervid hearts, and rang from their harps, with what impressions would it thrill us of the lofty intelligence and rectitude to which they are raised! It is not an expression of mere trust, but of knowledge; a raptured utterance of what they see in the clearest light of truth, and feel with the deepest sensibility. It bespeaks, accordingly, on the one hand, a most comprehensive acquaintance with the measures of God's government over the world, and a filial approval of them; and, on the other, a knowledge of all the impieties of the antichristian powers towards him, and malice towards his faithful worshippers. How else could they celebrate his works as great and wonderful, and his ways as just and true? And how beautiful a testimony to the wisdom, righteousness, and faithfulness of God, to be breathed into the ear of the listening universe from the lips of those who have suffered the greatest outrages from the persecutors and their predecessors, on whom the vials of avenging justice were about to be poured? They had been left of God to meet their infuriate rage; robbed of their possessions; torn from their families; driven into dens and forests for shelter; shut up in prisons; tasked in the mines; chained to the galley oar; broken on the rack, and consigned in a thousand torturing and ignominious forms to death: yet they chant his righteousness, truth, and skill, as wondrous in these very appointments, and proclaim their assurance that the displays he was to make of his justice in the judgments he was about to inflict on his foes, would inspire all other spectators with fear, and prompt all the nations to come and worship before him.

The vision thus shows us, in a most attractive and impressive form, that the ransomed of past ages are aware of the great judgments which God is now inflicting on the nations of the ancient Roman empire; that they contemplate them with adoring celebrations; and that they look forward with exulting assurance to the redemption of the world in which

they are soon to issue. Could we look up through the opened heavens, and survey their infinite host, we should see among them our pious ancestors and the believing associates and acquaintances who have passed from us, and hear them mingling their accents of wonder and joy in the strain. What a contrast their knowledge, trust, and joy, form to the error, unbelief, and indifference, that reign here in most even of the children of God! What a sad token it is of deep and dangerous misapprehensions that so little interest is felt by the church below in what thus engages their most earnest attention! Let us endeavor to catch something of their spirit. Let us contemplate the great scene that is passing before us, with the views and emotions with which they behold it, and be ready when the summons, comes to take our station with them on the glassy sea, and join in their chant of adoration and love.

---

ART. IX.—LITERARY AND CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCH IN HUNGARY, from the beginning of the Reformation to 1850, with special reference to Transylvania. Translated by the Rev. J. Craig, D.D., Hamburg. With an Introduction by J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D.D. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. New York: J. C. Derby. 1854.

THIS is a highly interesting history of a portion of the Protestant church, of which, out of its own limits, little has hitherto been known. The countries along the lower Danube have been the scene of a testimony for the truth against the usurping and apostate civil and ecclesiastical powers for a long series of centuries. A body of the Paulicians passed from Armenia into Thrace, in the eighth century, and subsequently spread into Bulgaria, Hungary, and Bohemia, and their missionaries, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, visited Italy, France, and Germany. In the twelfth century the Waldenses and Albigenses sent missionaries to Hungary, and from that time, a considerable body holding their faith, existed there till the rise of Huss and Jerome in Bohemia. The doctrines of those celebrated witnesses spread largely in Hungary and Transylvania, and maintained their hold in a considerable measure, especially among the

German population, till the Reformation in the sixteenth century; when nearly the whole nation embraced the evangelical doctrine. From that time to this, the Protestants have been the objects of a fierce and exterminating persecution by their Austrian rulers and the Jesuits; and have furnished a long line of confessors and martyrs for the word of God.

Had it been a leading purpose of the Most High so to arrange his providence, as to allow the usurping civil rulers, and ecclesiastics of Western Europe, to make a full experiment through a series of generations of their antichristian principles, and show their malignant character in the acts to which they prompt, and the results in which they issue, it is not easy to conceive conditions more adapted to that end, than those of the nations of Europe during the last three hundred and fifty years, nor to imagine a more dreadful exemplification than the career of the persecuting powers presents, of the falsehood and malevolence of their religion. If there was ever a system that had by its own acts fixed upon its brow indubitable marks of an infernal origin, it is that. Apostasy, usurpation of the rights of God, falsehood, treachery, tyranny, cruelty, bloodiness, an insatiable thirst of power, an inextinguishable hatred of the truth and its friends, are their characteristics; and they have been set forth in every conceivable form in the different states of Europe, and on a vast scale. In Great Britain and the German kingdoms in which the Protestants have a civil supremacy, Roman Catholicism has shown the form it assumes when under strong restraint, and its dreadful power in such circumstances to hold its vassals in bondage, and transmit its deadly virus from one generation of them to another. In Italy, Spain, and Portugal, it has held unobstructed sway, and revealed the horrid spirit with which it is animated, by exterminating the true worshippers, and reducing its vassals to the lowest depth of ignorance, superstition, and social and physical debasement. In France and Hungary, where, though the minority, the Protestants have formed too large a proportion of the population, to admit of their extermination, the Papacy has displayed in a still more dreadful form her implacable hatred of God and her exhaustless malignity towards his true worshippers, by pursuing the latter with fire and sword through a long succession of generations, and consigning myriads and millions of them in the most inhuman modes to death.

Who can doubt that ends of infinite moment are to be answered by these amazing exhibitions? Who can doubt that those ends are the preparation of the universe by the manifestation of the true character of man and of sin, for the redemption of the world under the reign of Christ, which is to be ushered in by the destruction of the anti-

christian powers ? And who can fail to rejoice that their overthrow is rapidly approaching, and is to be accomplished—not by the feeble hand of men, which a struggle of eighteen centuries has shown to be wholly inadequate to the task, but by the Almighty Redeemer himself, whose throne those usurpers arrogate, and whose religion they turn into an engine of death !

2. **IS CHRISTIANITY FROM GOD ? Or a Manual of Bible Evidence for the People.** By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D., Minister of the Scottish National Church, Crown Court, London. With an Introduction by the Hon. T. Frelinghuysen. New York : M. W. Dodd. 1854.

THIS brief and simple summary of the Evidences of the truth of the Christian Religion is excellently adapted to be useful. It treats of all the principal themes of the question—the immortality of the soul, the being of God, the authenticity, inspiration, and self-consistency of the Bible, and its general characteristics, gives explanations of difficulties, and answers to objections; and presents them with that clearness and vivacity that usually distinguish Dr. Cumming's writings.

3. **SERMONS ON THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.** By the Right Rev. George Burgess, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Maine. Philadelphia : Herman Hooker. New York : Stanford & Swords. Boston : Ide & Dalton. 1854.

THESE Discourses are the work of a cultivated mind, largely acquainted with man, imbued with the knowledge of the gospel, and earnest in teaching and enforcing its truths. While they are not elaborate disquisitions, neither are they trite common-places; but present their subjects in new and attractive attitudes, and invest them with a freshness of thought and neatness of diction, that render them excellently adapted to engage the interest of the reader, and leave salutary impressions.

4. **SUNLIGHT THROUGH THE MIST : being Conversations between a Mother and her Children on Luther and the Reformation.** By a Lady. With Illustrations. New York : Stanford and Swords. 1854.

THESE sprightly conversations detail the principal incidents of Luther's life in a very agreeable manner, and interwoven with them a series of domestic incidents, that give the narrative the charm for the young of a double story, and furnish opportunity for instructions and counsels that are especially suited to their age.

5. **PROPHETIC STUDIES.** Lectures on the Book of Daniel, by the Rev. John Cumming, D.D., Minister of the Scotch National Church. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1854.

**THE** themes of this volume are somewhat more extensive than the title indicates; as it treats not only of the chief visions and predictions of the prophecy, but of the character and history also of the prophet; the great personages with whom he was connected; and the events which he details. It is written in Dr. C.'s best manner, and is marked by great copiousness and often elegance of thought, warmth of feeling, and brilliancy of diction. His voice, however, as an interpreter, is far less authoritative than as a preacher; his views of the principles of symbolization and language being those that have been generally held by English and Scotch writers for the last two centuries. He accordingly follows in their train, and places on the events that are now passing, and some of the most important predictions that are yet to be accomplished, constructions in which we cannot acquiesce. He holds, for example, that the Ancient of days is the Eternal Word, instead of the Father; that the Stone cut out of the mountain without hands, is the symbol of Christ, instead of the risen saints, and that it has already begun to smite and crush the image; that England is no longer one of the ten kingdoms; that it is the Mohammedan power that is denoted by the little horn of the goat; and that the final catastrophe of the anti-christian thrones is very near. His expositions, nevertheless, of the great image, the tree, the beasts from the sea, the symbols and predictions of the eighth and ninth chapters, are in the main correct, and are adapted to awaken the interest of readers of all classes, and impress them with the truth and importance of the revelations made in the prophecy.

That he holds, in common with Millenarians generally, that men are to continue in the natural life, and subsist as nations after Christ's second coming, is seen from the following passage, in regard to the peoples, and nations, and languages, who are to serve him.

"This shows us that after the Ancient of days has come—after the thrones have been set—after the Son of man has been revealed in the clouds of heaven—all nations, people, and languages, existing in all their diversity, and with all their distinctions, but individually and morally saints, though circumstantially nations, shall constitute that empire of peace and joy, over which he shall reign in glory and in beauty. If this be so, nations will exist in the millennial reign. Perhaps all the distinctions that separate nation from nation shall be perpetuated then; but while they have different colors and com-

plexions, then as now—while they speak different tongues as they do now—they shall have one grand characteristic in common, they shall be the Saints of God, the Sons of the Most High. Asia, Africa, America, Europe, shall all be baptized by one Spirit, and washed in one fountain, and have in their hearts the image, the likeness, and the superscription of the Lamb." Pp. 247, 248.

6. *SYNONYMS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT*: being the substance of a Course of Lectures addressed to the Theological Students, King's College, London, by Richard Chevenix Trench, B.D., Professor of Divinity, King's College. New York: Redfield. 1854.

THIS work does not, as the title might perhaps lead the reader to suppose, present the whole series of synonymous terms in the New Testament, with definitions of their meaning and exemplifications of their usage; but a selection only of sixty sets that are the most important: and its object is not to establish the concurrence in meaning of the several synonymous words, but rather to point out the diversity of signification with which they are used. It is written much after the manner of Dr. George Campbell's "Inquiry into the difference of the import of words generally thought to be synonymous," though more brief; and displays fine powers of discrimination, thorough scholarship, sound judgment, and elegant taste; and is a most entertaining and instructive work. All who study the Greek Testament should avail themselves of its aid. That our readers may see the mode in which its themes are treated, we transcribe the article on Antichrist and Falsechrist.

§ xxx.—ἀντίχριστος, ψευδοχριστος.

THE word ἀντίχριστος is peculiar to the Epistles of St. John, occurring five times in them; 1 Ep. ii. 18, bis; ii. 22; iv. 3; 2 Ep. 7; and nowhere besides. But, although St. John only has the word, St. Paul has, in common with him, a designation of the person of this great adversary, and of the marks by which he shall be recognised; for there can be no doubt that the ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας, the υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, the ἄνομος of 2 Thess. ii. 3, 8, are all of them other designations of the same person (see Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, xx. 19, 2); and, indeed, to St. Paul and to that passage in his writings we are indebted for our fullest instruction concerning this great enemy of Christ and of God. Passing by, as not relevant to our purpose, many of the discussions to which the mysterious announcement of

such a coming foe has naturally given rise, as, for instance, whether we are to understand by the Antichrist a single person or a line of persons, a person or a system, there is only one of these questions which has a right to occupy us here; namely, what the force is of *ἀντί* in this composition; does *ἀντίχριστος* imply one who sets himself up *against* Christ, or one who sets himself up *in the stead* of Christ? Is he an open foe, who seeks violently to usurp his seat; or a false friend, that professes to hold it in his name?

There is no settling this matter off-hand, as some are in so great a hurry to do; seeing that *ἀντί*, in composition, has both these forces. It is used often in the sense of *substitution*; thus, *ἀντιβασίλεύς*, he who is instead of the king, 'prorex,' 'viceroy'; *ἀνθύπατος*, he who is instead of the consul, 'proconsul'; *ἀντιδεικνους*, he who fills the place at a feast of an absent guest; *ἀντίλυτρον*, the ransom paid instead of a person. Then, secondly, there is in *ἀντί* often the sense of *opposition*, as in *ἀντίθεσις*, *ἀντιλογία*, *ἀντισημειος*: and still more to the point, more exact parallels to *ἀντίχριστος*, as expressing not merely the fact of opposition, but in the latter half of the word, the very object against which the opposition is directed, *ἀντινομία* (see Suicer, *Theas.* s. v.), opposition to law; *ἀντιχειρ*, the thumb, as set over against the hand; *ἀντήλιος*, lying over against, and so exposed to, the sun; *Ἀντικάτων*, the title which Cæsar gave to a book which he wrote against Cato; *ἀντίθεος*,—not indeed in Homer, where it is applied to Polyphemus (*Od.* i. 70), and to the suitors (xiv. 18), and must mean 'godlike,' that is, in strength and power;—but yet, in later use, as in Philo; with whom *ἀντίθεος νοῦς* (*De Conf. Ling.* 19) can be no other than the '*adversa Deo mens*;' and so in the Christian Fathers. And the jests about an 'Antipater' who sought to murder his father, to the effect that he was *περὶ ἀντιπῶντος*, would be utterly pointless, if *ἀντί* in composition did not bear this meaning. I will not cite *Ἀντίεργος*, where the force of *ἀντί* is more questionable; and examples in sufficient number have been quoted already to prove that in words compounded with *ἀντί*, some imply substitution, some opposition; which being so, they have equally erred, who, holding one view of Antichrist or the other, have affirmed that the word itself decided the matter in their favour. It does not so; but leaves the question to be settled by other considerations. (See on this word *ἀντίχριστος* a masterly discussion by Lücke, *Comm. üb. die Briefe des Johannes*, pp. 190–194.)

For myself, St. John's words seem to me decisive on the matter, that resistance to, and defiance of, Christ, not the false assumption of his character and offices, is the essential mark of Antichrist; that which, therefore, we should expect to find embodied in his name;



thus see 1 John ii. 22; 2 John 7; and in the parallel passage, 2 Thess. ii. 4, he is ὁ ἀντίχριστος, where none will deny that the force of ἀντί is that of opposition: and in this sense, if not all, yet many of the Fathers have understood the word. Thus Tertullian (*De Præsc. Har.* 4): Qui Antichristi, nisi Christi rebelles? He is, in Theophylact's language, ἐναντίος τῷ Χριστῷ, 'Widerchrist,' as the Germans have rightly rendered it; one who shall not pay so much homage to God's word as to assert its fulfilment in himself, for he shall deny that word altogether; hating even erroneous worship, because it is worship at all, hating much more the Church's worship in spirit and in truth; who, on the destruction of every religion, every acknowledgment that man is submitted to higher powers than himself, shall seek to establish his own throne; and, for God's great truth, 'God is man,' to substitute his own lie, 'Man is God.'

The term ψευδόχριστος, with which we proceed to compare it, occurs only twice in the New Testament; or, if we count, not how often it has been written, but how often it was spoken, only once; for the two passages (Matt. xxiv. 24; Mark xiii. 22) are records of the same discourse. In form the word resembles so many others which appear to have been combined of ψεύδος and almost any other substantive at will. Thus ψευδαπόστολος, ψευδάδελφος, ψευδοδιδάσκαλος, ψευδοπροφήτης, ψευδομάρτυρ, all in the New Testament; the last also in Plato. So, too, in ecclesiastical Greek, ψευδοποιμήν, ψευδολατρία, and in classical, ψευδάγγελος (Homer), ψευδόμαντις (Herodotus), and a hundred more. The ψευδόχριστος is not one who denies the being of a Christ; on the contrary, he builds on the world's expectations of such a person: only he appropriates these to himself, blasphemously affirms that he is the Foretold One, in whom God's promises and men's expectations are fulfilled. Thus Barchochab, or "the son of the Star,"—as claiming the prophecy at Numb. xxiv. 17 he called himself,—who, in Adrian's reign, stirred up again the smouldering embers of Jewish insurrection into a flame so fierce that it consumed himself with more than a million of his fellow-countrymen—he was a ψευδόχριστος: and such have been that long series of blasphemous pretenders and impostors, the false Messiahs, who, since the rejection of the true, have, in almost every age, flattered and betrayed the expectation of the Jews.

The distinction, then, is plain. The ἀντίχριστος denies that there is a Christ; the ψευδόχριστος affirms himself to be the Christ. Both alike make war against the Christ of God, and would set themselves, though under different pretences, on the throne of his glory. And yet, while the words have this broad distinction between them, while they represent two different manifestations of the kingdom of wick-

edness, we ought not to forget that there is a sense in which the final Antichrist will be a Pseudochrist as well; even as it will be the very character of that last revelation of hell to absorb into itself, and to reconcile for one last assault against the truth, all anterior and subordinate forms of evil. He will not, it is true, call himself Christ, for he will be filled with deadliest hate both against the name and offices, as against the whole spirit and temper, of Jesus of Nazareth, now the exalted King of Glory. But, inasmuch as no one can resist the truth by a mere negation, he must offer and oppose something positive in the room of that faith which he will assail and endeavor utterly to abolish. And thus we may certainly conclude, that the final Antichrist will present himself to the world as, in a sense, its Messiah; not, indeed, as the Messiah of prophecy, the Messiah of God, but still as the world's saviour; as one, who, if men will follow him, will make their blessedness, giving to them the full enjoyment of a present material earth, instead of a distant and shadowy heaven; abolishing those troublesome distinctions, now the fruitful sources of so much disquietude and pain; those, namely, between the Church and the world, between the spirit and the flesh, between holiness and sin, between good and evil. It will follow, therefore, that however he will not assume the name of Christ, and so will not, in the letter, be a *Ψευδοχρίστος*, yet usurping to himself Christ's offices, presenting himself to the world as the true centre of its hopes, as the satisfier of its needs and healer of its hurts, he will in fact take up into himself all names and forms of blasphemy, will be the *Ψευδοχρίστος* and the *δωριχρίστος* at once.

7. **LEGENDS AND RECORDS**, chiefly Historical, by Charles B. Taylor, M.A. New York: Stanford & Swords. 1855.

THESE tragic stories, though indebted for their details to the fancy of the narrator, are founded mostly on events that occurred some two centuries ago, and present a truthful picture of their times. Many of the personages whose portraits they give, were believers in Christ, and exhibited in the distressful scenes through which they passed, a gentleness and submissiveness, a steadfastness of faith, and a victory over suffering and death, that are characteristic only of those in whom his Spirit reigns, and whose life is hid with him.

8. **GRATITUDE**. An Exposition of the Hundred and Third Psalm, by the Rev. John Stevenson. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1854.

THE fine group of themes presented by the Psalm, is treated by Mr.

Stevenson with point, copiousness, and warmth. He presents not a mere exposition of terms, or grammatical commentary, but an evolution rather of the topics of the Psalm, a delineation of the great features of the benignant providence which God exerts over his children, and portraiture of the gifts and deliverances with which he crowns their lives, along with counsels, warnings, and appeals, that are suited to rouse the mind to grateful recollection, and kindle it with love. The work may be read with advantage, not only by the pious who wish to impress themselves with a livelier sense of the divine goodness, but by all who would see the contrast which a heart glowing with sensibility to God's bounty and love, and uttering its gratitude and adoration, forms to one in which his benefactions excite no grateful sentiment, his fatherly smile meets no filial recognition.

9. APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES. Lectures on the Seven Churches of Asia Minor. By the Rev. John Cumming, D.D., Minister of the Scotch National Church, author of *Lectures on Miracles, Daniel, &c.* Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1854.

MANY writers have regarded the Epistles to the Seven Churches as prophetic of the state of the church generally in seven successive ages or periods, and have lost themselves in their exposition in a labyrinth of fanciful and absurd speculation. Dr. Cumming rejects that groundless notion, and treats them as indicating the principles on which Christ was to conduct his providence over the church during the present dispensation, and as fraught with instruction, therefore, that is equally suited to it at every stage of its progress. He accordingly selects from the attributes and prerogatives of Christ, the characteristics of the churches, their errors, dangers, and conflicts, the rebukes, warnings, and encouragements addressed to them, the judgments threatened to the apostate, and rewards promised to the faithful, such themes as together form an appropriate group for a course of lectures, and presents them with his usual amplitude, earnestness, and force. In his eighteenth and nineteenth lectures, he alleges many proofs that the Catholic Church has lost its hold, in a large measure, of the population of the Roman States, and repeats the belief which he utters in several of his other works, that the hour of her destruction is near. That she is to recover her supremacy, and for a short time wreak her vengeance on the true worshippers in a fresh persecution, he thinks is neither foreshown nor possible. In the form, however, in which she appears in the Apocalypse, immediately before her destruction, she is exhibited as borne by the wild beast, the symbol of the civil powers of the empire, and as drunk with the blood of the

saints ; and the slaughter of the witnesses at the close of their prophecy of twelve hundred and sixty years, is represented as immediately to precede the last trumpet, and the coming of Christ to the redemption of his people, and the judgment of his enemies, Rev. xvii. 3-18 ; xi. 3-19.

10. DANIEL A MODEL FOR YOUNG MEN. A Series of Lectures by the Rev. W. A. Scott, D.D. New York: R. Carter & Brothers 1854.

AMONG the finest Discourses, both in respect to the lessons they taught and the spirit they breathed, that we have ever heard or read, were the Baccalaureate addresses by Dr. Dwight to the graduating classes of Yale College. They gave the counsels, warnings, and encouragements that are most needed by youth in their circumstances, they made a profound impression at their delivery, and like the last accents of a venerated parent, were by many long recollected and affectionately cherished. The delivery of discourses to those who are just entering on the active pursuits of life, and encountering its temptations, which has of late become common in the cities, is highly appropriate, and will prove, we doubt not, the means of great good to many.

The Lectures of this volume were thus addressed by Dr. Scott to the young men of New Orleans, and they are well suited to their end. No finer theme could be selected from the whole range of the Bible for addresses to youth, than are presented by Daniel, and the eminent personages whose history is associated with his ; distinguished as they were by the greatness of their endowments ; the novelty of the conditions in which they were placed ; the beauty and strength on the one hand, with which the piety of those of them who feared God was exhibited, and the extraordinariness of the deliverances that were wrought for them ; and on the other, the extreme of wickedness displayed by those of them who feared him not, and the awfulness of the catastrophes with which they were overwhelmed. These various topics, the truth of the history, Daniel's character as a man and a prophet, Nebuchadnezzar's dream, the youths cast into the fiery furnace, the king's acknowledgment of Jehovah, God's universal dominion, Belshazzar's feast, the lions' den, and Daniel's deliverance, form a fine array, and are treated with a point and spirit that adapt them to engage the interest of the young, and exert on them a salutary influence. To those who have read Dr. Cumming's Lectures on Daniel, it will be felt to be a blemish that Dr. S. has so closely followed that writer on here and there a topic, and now and then

adopted a thought or expression without formally indicating it. That he consulted Dr. C.'s work, as well as many others, in preparing the Lectures, is indeed expressly announced in the preface, and shown by several specific references to him in the course of the volume, and the omission in all cases to distinguish the thoughts drawn from him, Dr. S. has stated, arose from his being precluded from a revision of the manuscript, and the supervision of the proof sheets. This defect, should a second edition be called for, will doubtless be remedied. We wish the crowd of young men in our cities and villages who are just entering on an active career, and forming their character for life, may be led to study its pages, and take the great prophet whose portrait it draws, as their model and guide.

11. LECTURES ON THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY. Delivered in Philadelphia by Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Fall and Winter of 1853-4. With an Introductory Essay by Alonzo Potter, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of the Diocese of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co. 1855.

THE specious and virulent assaults that have lately been made on Christianity, and the rapid spread of infidelity among those who bear the Christian name, as well as those who disown it, renders it peculiarly incumbent on the ministers of religion, to vindicate its truth, and guard their people against the bold misrepresentations and deceptive reasonings that are employed to betray them into doubt and unbelief. Though the attacks of the infidels of the present day are little else than a repetition of those of their predecessors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and their objections and arguments have been a thousand times answered, those answers are within the reach of but few; and there is no other method so direct and effective of bringing them to the knowledge of the age generally, as their reproduction in the pulpit, in the freshness, vigor, and adaptation to the present times, which they derive from a new treatment by original and earnest thinkers. To stand dumb spectators of the gigantic efforts which are made to extinguish the light of divine truth, and shroud the world in the darkness and horrors of atheism, without an attempt to arrest and defeat them, were to act the part of traitors to the gospel, instead of sentinels and soldiers who are set for its defence. This series of Discourses was designed to represent in a fresh and pointed form, on the one hand, the great evidences which establish the divine origin and truth of Christianity, and on the other, a confutation of the objections with which it is assailed; and they are well adapted to their object. Bishop Potter

gives in the Introductory Essay, a brief view of the history and doctrines of scepticism, of the problems that are to be treated in the vindication of Christianity, and of the mode in which they are to be handled. The themes of the Lectures are, on the one side, the philosophy of scepticism, and the several theories which it presents in antagonism to the Bible; and on the other, the analogies between God's world and word, miracles, the inspiration of the Scriptures, the historical and internal evidences of their truth, and other kindred topics, and they are treated with a degree of learning, spirit, and tact, that render them highly interesting, and fit them to be extensively useful.

12. **AN HISTORICAL TEXT BOOK AND ATLAS OF BIBLICAL GEOGRAPHY.** By Lyman Coleman, D.D. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co.

THIS manual is designed especially for the use of Sabbath scholars, Bible classes, and schools and seminaries of all ranks, and has every adaptation to its object that the most ample learning, a judicious arrangement, and accuracy, fulness, and tastefulness in the delineations and narratives can give. It is introduced by a series of maps of those parts of Asia, Africa, and Europe, that were known to the Hebrews, and presents a description of every country, mountain, sea, river, city, and place, that is mentioned in the Bible; the people, and eminent persons that have been connected with them; and the important events of which they have been the scene, arranged in chronological order. It is thus a comprehensive chart of the places, persons, and events, with their dates, mentioned in the sacred history, with their relation to each other; and contains a greater amount of useful and attractive information than can be found in any other work in the same compass. Instead of a dry catalogue of names and epochs, the delineations are minute and graphic, and present the scenes and incidents in the clearness and boldness with which they are drawn on the pages of the best class of travellers. No work can be more happily adapted to render the study of Biblical geography, history, and chronology, easy and attractive to the young.

13. **MESSIAH'S THRONE AND KINGDOM:** or the Locality, Extent, and Perpetuity of Christ's Kingdom. By the Rev. J. Harkness, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Fishkill Landing. New York: John Moffet, 82 Nassau street. 1855.

THE object of this volume is to unfold the promise respecting Christ,

addressed to the Virgin at the annunciation, that "the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end;" by showing what the throne is which he is to occupy, what the kingdom is over which he is to reign, when it is to be given to him, and its perpetuity.

The throne, he shows, is literally the throne of David, the king of Israel, not a mere metaphorical throne, or a sway of a different species. The mode in which he meets those who treat the promise as though it were a mere trope, is seen from the following passage.

"Those who contend for the spiritual interpretation of the passage, deny that Jesus Christ will sit personally, that is, as God-man, in glorified humanity upon the throne of his father David, and reign visibly in Jerusalem over the house of Jacob, or heaven's highly-favored people Israel; or that he will ever appear in person a reigning king upon the earth; and maintain that he will only sit spiritually upon David's throne, and have in them and over them a spiritual kingdom. . . . Now that Jesus Christ will reign spiritually over his people by his Holy Spirit working by his mighty influences in their hearts, is incontrovertibly a truth, and a very important and glorious truth; but it may be, and is questioned whether it is *the truth* taught in the prediction.

"Now to persuade the unprejudiced mind that this is *the meaning* of the passage, in all fairness it must be shown that David had a *spiritual throne*; that he could and did sit spiritually upon that throne, that his government was and is verily a spiritual government, and his kingdom a spiritual kingdom; for until this is done, it is impossible to see how the prediction can be fulfilled. If David had such a throne, surely we need to have it explained what it was, and how he who was a mere man like ourselves, could sit upon that spiritual throne; how material man could occupy a spiritual seat. If David had not such a throne, then it could not—as his—be promised to Christ. But David's throne was promised to Christ; and David's throne was, as we have seen, a material throne, consequently it was David's material throne that was promised to Christ; and when this is fulfilled, Christ must sit upon that material throne.

"We cannot give up the throne and the sitting upon it, as a mere figure of speech, to accommodate another interpretation; because David had his literal throne, and did literally sit upon it, and that throne was promised to the Virgin's Son, and promised that he might sit upon it. This is the plain grammatical meaning of the passage, and the only idea that would be conveyed to the mind of an un-biassed reader. But while we contend for the literality of the throne,

and sitting upon the throne, it is not for a moment to be supposed that it is denied, or insinuated that Christ does not reign by his Spirit in and over his people. That is a precious truth. . . . In that way he reigned in the first renewed heart; and he has so reigned in the heart of every believer, under every dispensation, from that period to the present hour; and if this is all that is meant by the throne of his father David being given to Jesus, it was only promising to give to him what he already, and had always possessed. According to this interpretation, nothing new was promised, and nothing new would be given. Nor is this difficulty removed by contending that the reign in this spiritual sense shall be more extensive, shall be over mankind generally; for the nature of the reign is the same—spiritual, and by the Spirit in the hearts of men. A mere extension of the government, no matter how great that extension may be, cannot change the nature and manner of the government itself; cannot introduce the king himself, and set him personally upon a visible material throne,” pp. 17–20.

He next proceeds to show that the kingdom over which Christ is to reign, is in this world, and is to be not simply the literal Israelites, consisting of the living restored from dispersion to their ancient land, and the pious of former ages raised from the dead, but the whole race; the time of the restoration and reorganization of that people being the time when all the Gentile nations also are to be sanctified, and the world universally become a scene of righteousness and peace.

In the third chapter on the perpetuity of this kingdom, he presents proof from a variety of passages that men are to continue in the natural life, and multiply under Christ's reign during the Millennium, which he holds is the symbol of three hundred and sixty thousand years, and that at length the curse of the fall is to be fully repealed, and those of the race thereafter coming into existence, enjoy an exemption from sin and temptation, essentially such as that which they would have enjoyed had Adam not fallen. Throughout the Millennium, however, he holds that sin in a measure and death will continue to reign.

The period of Christ's coming and assumption of this kingdom, he shows in his fourth chapter, is that of the judgment and destruction of the blaspheming and persecuting rulers of the fourth monarchy, when the saints of the Most High are to take the kingdom of the earth and possess it for ever and ever; and that coming—following in the track of Mr. Elliott, Dr. Cumming, and other English and Scotch writers—he regards as at a distance probably of not more than twelve or fifteen years. In this, however, we think he errs. The great series of events that are yet to intervene before Christ's advent



—the remodification of the monarchies of the ten kingdoms, the persecution and slaying of the witnesses, the sealing of the servants of God, the proclamation to all nations and peoples that the hour of God's judgment has come, the fall of Babylon, the warning of God's people to come out of her, her destruction, the emission of the unclean spirits, their embassy to the kings of the earth, and the assembling of the antichristian hosts at Armageddon to the last battle, seem to us to indicate that a much longer time is yet to pass, before the final catastrophe.

Whatever the period may be, however—he shows in the last chapter—when this kingdom is to be assumed by Christ, he is to receive its investiture from the Lord God. Though on some points we dissent from Mr. Harkness, his views are in the main correct, and they are sustained by an array of Scriptural evidence, and are reasoned with a fairness, force, and earnestness, that present a striking contrast to the baseless assumptions, bold sophistries, and slashing dogmatism of such writers as Brown, and some others who have lately appeared on the side of the spiritualists; and are adapted to give the truth he advocates a deep impression.

14. GENERAL HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND CHURCH, from the German of Dr. Augustus Neander. Translated from the last Edition, by Joseph Torrey, Professor in the University of Vermont, Volume Fifth, comprising the Sixth Volume of the Original. Published from the posthumous papers, by K. F. T. Schneider. First American edition. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1854.

THIS volume, which closes the series, extends the history from the last years of the thirteenth to the early part of the fifteenth century, the period in which Wickliff appeared in England, and Huss and Jerome in Bohemia, the Council of Constance met, a crowd of bold and faithful witnesses for the truth rose in almost every part of the ten kingdoms, and the corruptions of the Catholic church became so enormous as to raise the cry from all classes, that a reformation in her "head and members" was indispensable, to save her from speedy dissolution. Though this volume was prepared by another hand, from materials left by Neander, it has the general characteristics of those that preceded it, and from the eminent personages and great reformations of which it treats on the one side, and the lawless ambition, the atrocious crimes, and the merciless persecutions of the papacy on the other, is one of the most instructive in the train. Professor Torrey merits the thanks of the literary

community, for the ability with which he has performed his task as translator, and the publishers for the tasteful form which they have given the volumes.

15. THE BRITISH PERIODICALS. Republished by Leonard Scott & Co., New York.

THE Quarterlies for October and November present a finer assemblage of topics than usual. A large share of them are of a literary cast, and are treated with unusual point and elegance; and those that are scientific, are employed in the history and description of their objects, rather than in the discussion of principles. The most attractive group is that of the London Quarterly, the whole series of which is instructive and entertaining, while the articles on Church Bells, Architecture, Siluria, Goldsmith, and The Eclipse of Faith, present their topics with the freshness and ease for which that Quarterly is especially distinguished. The review of Sir R. Murchison's work on the Silurian system of rocks, while maintaining the current belief respecting the age of the world, indicates, like several other discussions that have lately appeared, that far less confidence is now felt than several years ago, in the assumptions and reasonings on which that belief is founded: the whole tide of recent discoveries tending to weaken and overthrow it, by showing, on the one hand, that animals and plants existed at the period of the formation of the earliest sedimentary rocks; and, on the other, that there is nothing in the strata themselves that forms such a measure of the time occupied in their deposition, as to demonstrate that the process must have begun anterior to the Mosaic epoch of the creation. The article on the Eclipse of Faith is an able vindication of the views held by the author of that work, and exposure of the blunders, sophistries, and quackery of Mr. Newman and his school.

Of the subjects of the Westminster—the Prospects of the Greek people, Rajah Brooke, and the Women of France, are of chief interest, and are treated with spirit.

The article in the Edinburgh on Vestries and Church Rates presents a sad picture of the animosities and contests that are excited in many parishes of the English establishment betwixt the parson and people by the present mode of levying taxes for the maintenance of the church edifice, and discharging other annual expenses that are not paid by the state. These conflicts spring from the imposition of the tax on all the residents of the parish, whether they are attendants at the church or dissenters, and the determination of the amount that is levied by a vote, in which all the tax-payers have a voice. There

is thence a continual struggle on the part of the opponents of the tax to reduce it to the lowest possible rate; and the annual meeting at which it is voted and the vestrymen who are intrusted with its appropriation are elected, is a scene often of contest, uproar, insult, and sometimes of outrage and mobbing. The evil has reached such a stage, that it seems to have become the feeling of all parties that the honor of religion, the safety of the establishment, and public peace, demand that it should be remedied by a change of the law; and the chief plans proposed are, the restriction of the tax to the attendants at the parish church; the payment of the requisite amount by the state treasury; or the abolition of all law respecting it, and allowance of the parishioners to raise the sum they need by voluntary tax or subscription; either of which will prove a step probably towards the denationalization of the church. The clamor on this subject is but one among many indications that the establishment is rapidly losing its hold on the national feeling, and that ere any long period has passed, the party may rise to the majority who wish its connexion with the state may be dissolved. The scenes delineated in the article on the Arab Tribes of the great desert, are stirring and picturesque; that on Railway Morals presents a startling revelation of the mismanagements and frauds that have marked the history of some of the principal railroads in Great Britain.

The North British opens with a highly entertaining article on the Zoological and Botanical Wonders of the Shore. The review of Sir H. Holland on Mental Physiology, Biology, &c., presents a vast array of curious facts and speculations. The notice of Milman's Latin Christianity is able and instructive; and that of Cowper, tasteful and pleasing. In the article on the Progress and Prospects of the War, the writer expresses a high confidence of the success of the Allies; but indicates what seems to be a very prevalent apprehension, that great modifications are to be wrought in several of the European kingdoms ere peace can be again firmly established. Among the changes at which he hints are, a liberation of Italy, the reconstruction of Poland, and a new distribution of territory to Prussia and Austria. That these and several other monarchies may soon fall, and be followed by democratic military despotisms, he seems not to suspect; but assumes that the future is to be much like the past, except that peace is more generally to prevail, and commerce, the useful arts, wealth, and happiness rapidly advance, and extend their domain over the whole world.

Blackwood has its usual variety of spirited articles.

16. APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES: Lectures on the Book of Revelation, in two volumes, by the Rev. John Cumming, D.D., Minister of the Scotch National Church. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1854.

IN these volumes, which have passed through a large number of editions in England, and are receiving a wide circulation here, Dr. Cumming follows mainly, as he announces in his first Lecture, in the track of Mr. Elliott, the author of the *Horæ Apocalypticæ*. His constructions, accordingly, are not founded on any settled principles of interpretation, but are the product in a large degree of fancy and conjecture: and though many of his views are just, and his pages sparkle with fine thoughts and brilliant images, on several of the most important parts of the prophecy, they are, we think, seriously mistaken. Thus on the assumption that the symbol and that which it symbolizes, are of the same species—he holds that the first four seals represent the wars, commotions, famines, and pestilences of the Roman empire of the second and third centuries. The fifth seal he refers to the close of the third century; and the sixth to the overthrow by Constantine of the pagan government and institution of a new rule in the beginning of the fourth. Assuming that the events foreshown were to take place in the order of the visions in which they are symbolized, he refers the sealing of the servants of God to the period that followed the nationalization of the church in the fourth century, and introduction into it of a crowd of unsanctified persons; and holds that instead of being made conspicuous by having the name of God stamped on their foreheads, their being sealed denotes that they were hidden. While with most modern commentators he regards the first four trumpets as symbolizing the invasion and devastation of the Roman empire by the northern hordes in the fourth and fifth centuries; the fifth and sixth as fulfilled in the incursions and conquests of the Saracens and Turks; and the predictions of the tenth chapter as verified in the Reformation; he represents the slaughter of the witnesses as having taken place immediately before the Reformation,—a construction, as we have shown in the article in the present number on the Results of the Laws of Symbolization, altogether untenable, and involving those who entertain it in a variety of other important errors.

He interprets the wild-beast of seven heads and ten horns from the sea, as symbolizing by its head "the Roman bishop that heads the apostasy of Rome," and by its body, the ten kingdoms: a mistake that leads him to the misconstruction of the other symbols that are connected with it—the image, Babylon, and the beast from the abyss. The last he regards, indeed, as the same as the beast from

the sea. He calls the Pope the eighth head of the beast, under which he supposes it has subsisted during near twelve hundred and sixty years, and is to subsist till its destruction. He is led into this error by assuming that αὐτὸς ὀγδόος, Rev. xvii. 11, have κεφαλή as the noun with which they agree. The latter, however, is feminine, not masculine. The noun with which ὀγδόος agrees is βασιλεύς, v. 10, and the prediction accordingly is, that "the wild beast that was and is not, is the eighth *King*, and is of the seven," that is, of the same rank or class as the seven, and thence the king of the whole empire, as the rulers denoted by the seven previous kings were. The prediction, therefore, presents no intimation that the wild-beast has an eighth head, and Dr. C.'s construction is built wholly on a false ground. The wild beast, indeed, is not the symbol in any relation of the pope, or the papacy; but is the representative solely of the civil rulers of the Roman empire under the ten kings, during the twelve hundred and sixty years. The beast from the abyss is the symbol of those rulers in the form they are to assume when the eighth king appears at the head of the whole empire, and the ten kings give their power to him, Rev. xvii. 11-13, and its then bearing the woman Babylon seated on it, drunk with the blood of the saints, shows that the Catholic hierarchies are at that epoch, immediately before their fall, to be nationalized, or sustained by the state, and to exert their power in the persecution of the witnesses of Jesus. Their fall is to be their denationalization, and the precursor of their destruction.

He regards the judgments predicted under the first four vials, as inflicted in the French revolution and the wars that followed it; but holds that the throne of the pope was the object of the fifth, and the Turks the object of the sixth.

The three unclean spirits he deems to be symbolic of infidelity, popery, and priestcraft or Puseyism, and to be already emitted and busy in their task; and he offers a sad array of proofs of their prevalence in Great Britain as well as on the continent. The seventh vial he regards as now pouring, the catastrophes that have during the last seven years befallen the papacy as the commencing steps of her fall, and the coming of Christ as at hand. He looks for no future triumph of the papacy, no new persecution, and no important modification of the civil governments of the ten kingdoms anterior to their final overthrow. In his second volume he treats chiefly of the events that are to follow Christ's advent, and presents a glowing picture of the righteousness, glory, and bliss, that are to mark the millennial reign.

THE  
THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY  
JOURNAL.

---

VOLUME VII.

APRIL, 1855.

NUMBER IV.

---

ART. I.—DR. HICKOK'S RATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY.

BY THE EDITOR.

IN our former article on this subject, we showed that Dr. Hickok, in his investigation of the function of the senses, proceeds on the assumption that they take no cognisance whatever of external objects, but only furnish the intellect with phenomena that take place in themselves, the apprehension of which involves a knowledge only of what exists within the percipient, not of anything external to him. He proceeds on that view also in his investigation of the functions of the understanding, and founds on it—following in the train of Kant,—his theory of that faculty. As the senses, according to him, take no cognisance of external things; as nothing comes within their sphere but mere qualities, without any substances to which they belong, and that are the causes of their appearance in the senses, the mind must derive its apprehension of substances as the ground of those qualities from some other quarter. For its apprehensions are not confined to qualities. It regards them as belonging to substances,—to positive existences of which they are elements, and of the being, powers, and activities, of which

VOL. VII.—NO. IV.

84

they are the exponents. The office of generating these apprehensions he refers to the understanding. He regards that as a peculiar faculty stationed between the senses and the reason, and holds that its special function is to take cognisance of the phenomena of the senses, and account for them by conceiving of external substances in which they inhere; and of a universe of such substances that are in perpetual activity with powers and under laws that explain the phenomena of the senses. Of the reality of these supposed exterior subsistences, the understanding, however, he maintains, has no knowledge whatever. It only *conceives* of them. It has only a *notion* of them, as existences, that *if real*, would account for the appearances that take place in the senses. They have, to the mind, only a hypothetical, or conceptional subsistence; or in other words, the mind, instead of *perceiving and knowing* them, only *conceives* of them. Thus he says:—

“The notion, as supplied by the understanding, is put under the phenomena as substratum in which they inhere, or as source on which they depend; and as it is a peculiar operation of the intellect which supplies this notion, and makes it to *stand under* the phenomena as their connexion, so this function of the intellect, as faculty for connexion, is appropriately termed *the understanding*. The same intellect *conjoins* the diversity—and this is the faculty of the sense—which *connects* the phenomena—and this is the faculty of the understanding.

“This connecting of phenomena in their grounds and sources by the understanding, is the act of *thinking*; and the product should be termed a *philosophical judgment*, distinguishing it from the process of conjoining in unity, which is the act of *attending*, and the product of which, as intuitively affirmed, is a *mathematical judgment*. Both are synthetic, inasmuch as both attain a new conception, in which the relationship is given; but in one case, as the mathematical, the new conception is attained by an immediate intuition in a construction; and in the other, the philosophical, the new conception cannot be constructed, and thus cannot be intuition, but is wholly supplied as *thought or notion*, by the understanding.

“In the philosophical judgment we are obliged to receive the notion, as connective, from the understanding; and then the relationship is always apprehended only by a *discursus* through that notion; and thus the judgment is necessarily *discursive*, not intuitive. We

go from the whiteness to the hardness in our connecting of these as qualities in a thing, through the *notion* of ivory as common substratum; and we go from the impinging to the displacing [of one ivory ball by another] in our connecting of these as events, through the notion of impulse as source in the antecedent for the origination of the consequent. The judgment can only be formed from the process of connexion; and the connexion can only be made in the *notion*; and the notion is supplied by no possible intuition. We can thus connect; i. e. *think* in the understanding in no other possible manner than discursively. The understanding is faculty only for connecting, not for constructing; for *thinking*, not for attending; for discursively concluding, not for intuitively beholding.

"That the notional is conditional for all experience, as a connexion of the phenomena into things, should be fully apprehended, and may be very conclusively determined. Thus, I may have the definite and distinctive qualities of a hardness, a coldness, a brittleness, a transparency, &c., as real phenomena in perception, but they are all necessarily separate from each other as given in perception, and no conjunction can go any further than to give to each its complete form as phenomenon, and let them stand singly and separately in the consciousness. But when the understanding has supplied its notion of a ground common to them all, *the thinking* may then connect them all in it by a discursus from one to another through it, and give to this notion as connective ground a name as thing, and of which the phenomena will all be held in a judgment as common properties and qualities; and I may then say, *the ice* is hard, is cold, &c. My perception in the *sensu* has given the phenomena only; my *thinking* in the understanding has given me all the separate phenomena to be connected in one thing; but such a *judgment*, that the one thing—*ice*—contained in itself all these phenomena as its qualities, and which is essential to a proper experience of such qualities, could not be attained except I had first *assumed this notion* of a common ground, through which to make my discursus in *thinking* the phenomena respectively to inhere in it. So in the same manner I may perceive the phenomena of a liquidness, limpidness, fluidity, &c., and by a supplied notional, as ground, I may connect them as the properties of one thing, and call it *water*: and then again, I may perceive the phenomena of volatility, expansibility, elasticity, &c., and connect them in a common ground in the understanding and call it *vapor*; and as the result, I shall have the three things with their respective qualities, as ice, water, and vapor. Neither of these things could have been given in an experience, but only the distinct phenomena in perception, except as the understanding had sup-



plied their notional connectives, and thought them in a judgment discursively thereby.

"But still further, with these three things distinct in a judgment of experience, I may proceed in the understanding and supply, a higher notional connexion as common source for them all, and *think* these three things to have successively come out of one and the same material substance, which has now been ice, and now water, and now vapor, and thus on through all possible changes. But it is manifest that no such connexion in this comprehensive judgment of an experience could have been effected, except at first this higher notional, as common source, had been supplied in the understanding. And thus ever, in all our judgments of experience, whether more or less comprehensive, the experience does not give the connexion, but the connexion produces the judgment of experience, and this rests wholly upon a supplied notional in the understanding. No possible thinking in discursive judgment can be effected, and thus no experience can be except through the use of a *notion* supplied in the understanding. The judgment cannot be *in* the sense; for the sense cannot supply the notional, nor make the discursive connexion through it: but the judgment is *according* to the sense, for it must be the connexion of only such phenomena as are given in the sense. We may thus say of the understanding, that it is a higher faculty than the sense, but though transcending the sense, it yet is a faculty of judging according to the sense. It connects only what is first given in the sense."—Pp. 333-340.

He thus maintains, that the mind has no knowledge either through the senses or the understanding of anything beyond the mere qualities or phenomena that appear in the sense and exist exclusively, according to him, in the percipient; and holds that external substances in which those qualities are thought to subsist, are mere conceptional existences that have no being out of the understanding, whose special function it is, he asserts, to generate notions of them, and ascribe to them their respective qualities; and as the being of the substances is a mere notion, so the subsistence in them of qualities that are referred to them is, he represents, a *judgment or thought* of the understanding, not an ascertained *fact*. There are in reality, he holds, no known substances in which qualities subsist; there is no known or knowable exterior universe. All that lies within the scope of our perception is mere phenomenon that takes place

within ourselves. And he accordingly makes it the object of his investigation of the functions of the understanding, first, to show how it may conceive of a substance or substances to which all the qualities known to the senses may be referred, and which may be *thought* as the sources from which all phenomena emanate, and next to determine by an *a priori* process, what the idea and law of such notional substances must be, and at length show that they are in harmony with our experience, or explain the actual appearances of the universe. And the *notion* which he conceives for the purpose is, that of space-filling substances that possess all the powers that are requisite for producing all the species of phenomena in their places and periods throughout the realms of space and time, and cause them to take place in the sense: that is, *a conception of the existence of external substances of precisely such natures and qualities as those which in fact make up the sensible universe, and are the objects of our sense-perceptions, but of the actual existence and agency of which, he denies that we have, or can have any knowledge!*

The question now is, whether this view of the understanding and its functions is correct or not. We maintain that, like his notion of substances, it is a mere conception.

1. If the mind have a faculty that fills such a peculiar sphere, Dr. H. should have verified its existence. He offers, however, not a solitary proof of its reality. He assumes its being, and though ascribing to it functions of which no one is conscious, takes it for granted that it will be recognised as a genuine and commanding faculty of the mind, as indubitably as the organs of sense are parts of the body. He has assumed its existence and powers from Kant, without inquiring whether such a faculty belongs to our nature or not. That he drew his theory wholly from him, is seen from the following passages of Kant's Critic of Pure Reason.

"Our cognition springs from two fundamental sources of the mind, the first of which is to receive representations (the receptivity of the impressions) [on the senses]; the second, the faculty by means of those representations, of cognising an object (spontaneity of the conceptions). Through the former, an object is given to us. By the second, this (object) is *thought* in relationship with such

representation (as mere determination of the mind). [That is, the relationship in which the object is thought as standing to the representative in the senses, is determined by the mind itself, not by the nature of the object, and the apprehension of it through the senses.] Intuition and conceptions form, therefore, the elements of all our cognition: so that neither conceptions without an intuition in *some way corresponding to them*, nor intuition without conceptions, could produce cognition.

"If we will term the *receptivity* of our mind for receiving representations, so far as it is in some way affected, *sensibility*; so is on the other hand the faculty itself of bringing forth representations, or the *spontaneity* of the cognition, the *understanding*. Our nature has for its property, that the intuition can never be other than *sensible*, that is, it contains only the *mode* in which we are affected by objects. On the contrary, the faculty of *thinking* the object of sensible intuition is the *understanding*. Neither of these properties is to be preferred to the other."—Pp. 56, 57.

"There is, besides intuition, no other mode of cognising, except by conceptions; consequently, the cognition of every understanding, at least every human one, is a cognition by means of conceptions, not intuitive, but discursive. All intuitions as sensible repose upon affections, and conceptions, therefore, upon functions. But I understand under functions, the unity of action so as to order different representations under a common one. Conceptions, therefore, are based upon the spontaneity of thought, as sensible intuitions are upon the receptivity of impressions. [That is, conceptions are generated solely by the understanding, precisely as according to him, the phenomena of sight, touch, &c., are by the senses. That each class are what they are, is owing solely to the faculty in which they take place, not to the objects which apparently excite them, and which they seem to respect.] Now the understanding can make no other use of these conceptions, except that it *judges* by means of them. As no representation refers immediately to the object, but to the intuition only, so a conception never refers immediately to an object, but to some other representation of this, whether it (the representation) is intuition, or even already conception. *Judgment* is, therefore, the mediate cognition of an object; consequently, the representation of a representation of it."—Pp. 70, 71.

"But there are two conditions under which only the cognition of an object is possible; first, intuition, whereby this object is given, but only as phenomenon; secondly, the conception whereby an object is *thought* which answers to this intuition. But it is clear from what has preceded, that the previous condition, namely, that

under which alone objects can be envisaged, in fact *lies in the mind à priori*, as a *foundation of these objects* in respect of the *form*. With this formal condition of sensibility, all phenomena therefore necessarily coincide, since they only appear by means of it; that is, can only be empirically envisaged and given. Now the question is, whether also *conceptions à priori* do not precede as conditions, under which alone *something, although not perceived*, still is *thought an object* in general: for then *all empirical cognition of objects* is necessarily *conformable with such conception*, because, without the *presupposition of them*, nothing is *possible as object of experience*. [In other words, let it be assumed that the understanding, by virtue of its powers and law of agency, determines what the mind's conceptions shall be of the objects that seem to the senses to be external; precisely as it would if its conceptions of substances were not preceded by, nor associated with any perceptions through the senses; and then it will follow that the objects of the senses—no matter what they are, nor whether they have existence or not—will be *thought to be* what the understanding makes them. That they are *judged to be* what they are, will be owing solely to the understanding as pure creations of that faculty; not to the nature or reality of any external objects which they seem to respect, nor to the nature of the representations of them that are presented by the senses.] But now all experience besides the intuition of the senses whereby something is given, also contains a *conception* of an object, which is given in the intuition, or appears. Therefore conceptions of objects in general will be as conditions *à priori* at the foundation of all cognition of experience. The objective validity of the categories as conceptions *à priori*, will consequently repose on this:—that through them alone experience, in respect to the *form* of thought, is possible. For they then refer necessarily and *à priori* to objects of experience, since only by means thereof generally can an object of experience be thought."

"The transcendental deduction of all conceptions *à priori* has therefore a principle to which the whole inquiry must be directed, namely, this, that these must be acknowledged as *conditions à priori of the possibility of experience* (whether it be of the intuition which is met with therein, or of thought). Conceptions which furnish *the objective ground of the possibility of experience*, are just on this account necessary. But the development of the experience wherein they are found is not their deduction (but illustration), inasmuch as thereby they would still only be contingent. Without this original relationship to possible experience, in which all objects of cognition present themselves, the relationship of the same to any objects could not at all be comprehended."—*Critic of Reason*, pp. 95–97.

Our conceptions of external objects are, thus, according to him, determined—not at all by the objects themselves, nor by our perceptions of them by sight, touch, or other senses—but solely by the understanding,—precisely as the stamp on a coin depends on the die, not on the metal of which it consists; and as the words on a page depend on the types or plate from which it is printed, not on the metal of which the types consist, the ink, or the paper; so that identically the conceptions we now have would continue to arise in the understanding, were any possible or conceivable change to take place, either in the objects that act on us, the mode of their agency, or the effects produced by them on our senses. And it was thus to make the mind the mould to which all conceptions owe their form, instead of owing them to the objects which they respect, that he denied that we have any perception of external objects through the senses; and invested the understanding with the function of giving them their form, or representing them by arbitrary conceptions. Thus he says:—

“Up to the present time it has been received, that all our cognition must regulate itself according to *the objects*; yet all attempts to make out something *à priori* by means of conceptions respecting such whereby our cognitions would be extended, have proved under this supposition abortive. Let it be once, therefore, tried whether we do not succeed better in the problems of metaphysics, when we admit that *the objects must regulate themselves according to our cognition*—which thus accords already better with the desired possibility of their cognition *à priori*, which is to decide something with respect to objects before they are given to us. The circumstances in this case are precisely the same as with the first thoughts of Copernicus, who, since he did not make any way in the explanation of the motions of the heavenly bodies, when he supposed the whole firmament turned round the spectator, sought whether it might not answer better if he left the spectator himself to turn, and the stars on the contrary at rest. Now, in metaphysics, as to what concerns *the intuition of objects*, we may try in the same way. If the intuition must regulate itself according to the property of *the objects*, I do not see how one can know anything with regard to it *à priori*; but if *the object regulates itself* (as object of the senses), according to the property of our *faculty of intuition*, I can very well represent to myself this possibility. But since I cannot remain stationary with these intuitions, if they are to become

cognitions, but must refer them as representations to some thing as object, and determine this object by means of them, I can admit that *the conceptions* whereby I bring about this determination either regulate themselves *according to the object*—and then I am again in the same difficulty respecting the mode, as I can *à priori* thereof know nothing—or I admit that *the objects*, or what is the same thing, *experience*, in which alone as given objects they are known, regulates itself according to those *conceptions*; and I thus see immediately an easy escape, because experience itself is a mode of cognition which requires *understanding*, the rule of which I must suppose *in myself* before objects are yet given to me—consequently *à priori*, which rule is expressed in cognitions *à priori*, and according to which cognitions therefore all objects of experience must necessarily regulate themselves and coincide therewith.”—*Kant's Preface*, pp. xv. xvi.

The reason Kant gives for exhibiting the understanding as giving form to the objects of the senses by its conceptions, instead of its conceptions receiving their form from those objects, thus is, that the law of the understanding in its conceptions and judgments may be determined *à priori*. Whether the understanding or sense are in fact such faculties as he represents them, he does not inquire; but assumes and proceeds on it as though it needed no demonstration. In like manner, Dr. H., who draws his theory of the understanding wholly from Kant, enters into no inquisition of the legitimacy of his theory. He assumes it as though it were universally known, and could no more be questioned than the fact that we have senses and intelligence. It is not a good omen, however, that the foundation on which their whole system rests, should be left without verification. A theory that casts its shadow thus over the whole domain of metaphysics and theology, should not be gratuitously assumed. If able, why did they not demonstrate the existence of this extraordinary faculty? Not a consideration, however, is offered by them to prove its being, or verify its powers. If the reader accepts it as a fact, it must be solely on their mere assumption and representation.

2. If we are possessed of such a power it should be easy to verify its existence. It should be as easily distinguishable from the other powers of the intellect as memory, imagination, or reason is, and its peculiar functions as well known

to consciousness. No one, however, is conscious of a faculty whose office it is to form conceptions of external substances, of which he has no knowledge, for the purpose of referring to them as their ground, the phenomena of the senses, which otherwise would, to the mind, have no substratum or object. No one ever, except in a process of abstraction, conceives of phenomena as existing irrespective of a substance by which they are caused, and of which they are predicable. No geologist, chemist, zoologist, or other student of nature, on finding a new form of matter, organized or unorganized, announces that he has merely discovered a new group of phenomena or qualities, which he has not yet referred to a substance, as their ground; and that he postpones that task to a future opportunity, when he designs to conceive by his understanding of an unknown something, in which he may regard them as inhering. Were the understanding, however, such a faculty as Kant and Dr. H. represent, that process would be as familiar to every one's consciousness as any other that has its ground in our nature. Their definition of the faculty and its functions presents as absolute an *à priori* certainty that if it be just, the phenomena or qualities that appear in the senses must first be contemplated by the intellect as existing without a substratum, and that the conception by the understanding of an unknown substance to which they belong must be a subsequent act; as the definition of memory, as the reproduction in the intellect of a thought or apprehension that has before existed there, with a consciousness of that prior existence, forms an *à priori* certainty that a prior existence in the mind of a thought, feeling, or volition, is a necessary condition of its being remembered. The very object of the mind, they represent, in forming a conception of an unknown external substratum to which it may refer the qualities perceived through the senses, is to satisfy its feeling of the want of an external subsistence to which it may refer those qualities as their ground and cause, and thereby form an intelligent and consistent scheme of the system of nature: and that supposes

the qualities perceived by the senses are originally con-  
 \* irrespective of any object to which they belong,  
 \* a substratum. Why else should the under-  
 the necessity of furnishing a conception of

such a substratum in order to an intelligible apprehension of them. How happens it then, if the understanding is such a faculty as they describe it to be, that no one is conscious of thus uniformly viewing qualities irrespective of any object to which they belong, before conceiving of the object to which he finally refers them?

3. But he wholly misrepresents the mind in exhibiting it as forming its conception of an external substance as the ground and cause of the qualities beheld by the sense, subsequently to the perception of those qualities themselves, and by a separate and independent act. So far from passing through such a double process, its apprehension of the external objects to which the qualities belong that are perceived by the senses, is involved in, and in fact identical with, its perception of the qualities themselves. There is a direct and absolute perception of the object in the perception of the qualities, and the two neither ever are nor can be separated from each other except by analysis. As we look upon a stately tree that towers before us into the sky, and spreads its limbs on every hand, it is an exterior existence that we see, not a mere phenomenon within the mind,—an external substance, that on examination we find has not merely extension, figure, color, and motion, but solidity, roughness, roundness, weight, flexibleness, organization, life, growth, and a substance that intercepts the rays of the sun, causes the wind to murmur, loses its leaves in autumn, and is capable of being separated into parts, wrought into a thousand shapes, expanded by heat, contracted by cold, and resolved into a variety of elements by fire; not a mere assemblage of such phenomena in the mind. It is absurd to talk of solidity, roughness, flexibleness, roundness, weight, extension, figure, and color, *in the mind*. We cannot even *conceive* of them as existing there. They are qualities only of exterior material existences which act on our senses, and produce our perception of them. Our perception, accordingly, is a perception of that material external existence which thus acts on our senses. That is the form which our perceptive act has to our consciousness: and it is the only form which it can assume. No law of our nature is more absolute, nor more perfectly determined. No theory or scepticism can ever drive our nature into any other



apprehension of the reality. None of the speculatists who have affected to question this fact, have ever been able for a moment to act on the supposition that the objects discerned through the senses have not a real exterior existence, are not actually discerned by them, and are not truly such material subsistences as they apprehend them to be. And the reason that they perceive them as external to themselves is, that they are actually external. The reason that they perceive their figure, that is the limits within which they are circumscribed, is that they are actually bounded by those limits. The reason that they are felt to be rough, smooth, heavy, flexible, or otherwise, is that they are actually what they are felt to be. And the reason that they have the color with which they are invested, is that they have the power of reflecting the light that is radiated on them from the sun, or other light-giving body, which forms that appearance to the eye. As the figure of a tree is nothing but the boundary of the space within which the tree is circumscribed, the perception of the figure is the perception of the boundary of the tree itself, not of the boundary of a nonentity. And as it could not be perceived nor exist without the tree, so it cannot be perceived without a perception of the tree. So far from our forming a conception of external objects, *after* we have discovered their qualities, and by a different and independent act, our discovery of many of the qualities usually follows the perception of the objects as external existences. Our mere sight of a tree is a perception of it as a veritable external existence: though it may not be till long after, that we learn what its peculiar qualities are compared with other external objects. A chemist who merely catches a glimpse of a new mineral body, is as certain that he sees an external material existence, though he knows nothing of its peculiar structure, weight, solidity, solubleness, expansiveness, and many other properties, as he is when he has explored its nature by all the tests which his science enables him to apply to it; and because in the glimpse he catches of its figure and color, he perceives that ~~it is~~ <sup>it</sup> is an external material substance; inasmuch as figure and color cannot exist of themselves independently of any ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup>; and there is no substratum of them except a material substance. The mystification in which the subject

has been involved by writers, has arisen from a tacit assumption, that if an external object could really be seen by the eye, it would produce a different effect on the organ from what it now does, and that if it could be really felt, it would affect the touch in a different manner. But that is altogether mistaken. It is because the tree at which we look is truly seen by us, and not anything else, that it appears as it does; and it is because it produces the effect it does on the eye, that it is seen. If it did not affect the eye as it does, it would not be seen; and if it were not really seen, the sight of it would not have the form to our consciousness which it now has, of a positive perception of it. Dr. H., following in the steps of Kant, has thus given a wholly mistaken view of the nature and mode of our apprehension of the objects which we perceive by the senses.

4. Neither Kant, nor Dr. Hickok, furnishes any explanation of the fact that, to our apprehension, the objects perceived by the senses have a real existence external to ourselves, nor is it possible, on their theory, to account for it. If the objects we perceive, truly exist without us, are beheld by us, and are what they appear to us to be, then our apprehension of them as such external objects is caused by these facts, and is explained; but if they are not perceived by us, and have no external existence, if they are mere phenomena within the mind itself, produced by our faculties or by some unknown cause, then that apprehension is in total contradiction to fact, and is incapable of explanation. Why should they naturally and unavoidably have the appearance to us of external subsistences that act on our senses and cause our perception of them, if they have no such external existence, and exert no such agency on us; if no ground exists either in them or in ourselves, for our apprehensions of them as exterior objects that exist independently of us? The supposition that they are mere internal phenomena is the grossest contradiction to our laws of thought; as it is in fact a supposition that our apprehension of them as external subsistences is an effect without a cause.

5. If the understanding is such a faculty as Kant represents, and if it generates, in the mode he describes, our conceptions of the subsistences to which it refers the qualities perceived by the senses, it is inexplicable that it should

conceive of those subsistences as exterior to itself, and as causes that act on the organs of sense and produce their phenomena. Why, if the whole ground of their existence and nature lies in the mind itself, should the mind be borne by a resistless instinct and necessity to conceive of them as produced by external causes, of the nature and being of which it has no knowledge nor probability? How can it be that such a false notion should take possession of it, and be the unavoidable and imperative law of its nature, instead of the consciousness, which would still inevitably reign in it, that its own nature was the sole cause of the phenomena of the senses, and that the objects to which it ascribes an external and independent existence, have no being but in its own apprehensions? If Kant's theory of the understanding were true, it would be altogether unnatural, and in contradiction to what would be its clear consciousness, that it should attempt to account for the phenomena of the senses by the conception of an external universe of material causes.

The faculty to which he assigns such extraordinary functions, is thus altogether fabulous. There are no evidences of its existence. It is not known to consciousness. Instead of furnishing any explanation of our apprehensions of external objects, it contradicts them, and would make them wholly impossible. It was arbitrarily got up by Kant, to supply the office in a measure, which he falsely denied to the intellect through the senses, of a direct perception of external objects. As the objects of the senses are unavoidably regarded as external, as having a real existence, and as actually perceived by us, if they are not such, but are, as Kant held, mere creations of the mind itself, and have no existence but within, then some faculty is necessary for generating them; and the understanding, accordingly, was invented by him, and invested with its peculiar functions for that purpose. Dr. Hickok has adopted it from him, apparently without inquiry whether it is in fact an element of our nature, or a suspicion of the difficulties with which the supposition of its existence is embarrassed.

With this fictitious faculty, therefore, that part of his Psychology which is founded on it falls to the ground. It is, in truth, a mere theory of idealism, and contradicts his

seeming admission of the reality of the external universe, as well as our nature.

He fails, accordingly, in the ontological demonstration—with which he closes his psychology of the understanding—of “the valid being of an outer law of things as universal nature.” For all that he alleges as proof of the validity of that outer law, is the difference of the mind’s apprehensions of objects that are presented to the senses and judgments respecting them, from its apprehension of mere ideal objects and judgments respecting them. He says:—

“Let it be admitted that an intellectual force truly exists with an inherent law of operation or function of our understanding; such understanding in actual being can by no means produce phenomena connected in their notional law, or determined, in space and time, and thus give an experience of universal nature.

“If such understanding may have a conception of the varied phenomena of sense, and may think them in connexion according to its conditional law for all discursive judgment; yet this could only be subjective, and a mere semblance of a nature of things. The *manner* of thinking would be conditioned by the inherent law of the understanding, but such ideal world of nature might have any *place*, and occupy any *period*, and its phenomena might be of any *variety*, according to any arbitrary scheme of the reproductive imagination. A real objective nature of things conditions the thinking, not merely in the manner of connexion, but in its place and period, and its particularity of phenomena and occurrence of events. No possible ideal system of nature can attain for itself those universally conditioned connexions of things which belong to a veritable universe, and which fix it in its own space and time, and all its single facts in their own places and periods.”—Pp. 527, 528.

This, however, in the first place, is no proof to an idealist of the reality of an outer universe; inasmuch as though he denies the existence of such a universe, he yet admits that there is such a difference as that of which we are conscious, between the mind’s apprehensions of the objects that are presented to it through the senses, and which it instinctively regards as existing externally, and its apprehensions of mere ideal objects, and judgments respecting them.

But, in the next place, Dr. Hickok here, in effect, renounces the identical theory of the understanding which

he presents in his definitions, and on which he has proceeded through the whole of his discussion on the subject, and declares that our apprehensions of external objects, and laws of thought in regard to them, cannot have their origin in such a faculty. For he has taught, on the one side, that the senses take no cognisance of external existences; that the intellect has no perception through them of an exterior world; and that nothing appears in their sphere except mere phenomena that have their ground exclusively in the percipient, and exist only to him. And, on the other side, he maintains that the understanding deals with what appears in the senses simply as such phenomena, that has no counterpart in an outer world; that it has no perception through them of exterior things; but that instead, it *conceives* of substances of whose existence and nature it has no knowledge, as objects to which it refers the phenomena of the senses; and treats those unknown conceptional existences as a veritable external universe, or nature of things. But this is identically such an "ideal system of nature" as he now disowns, and denounces as unable to attain for itself those universally conditioned connexions which belong to a veritable universe, and fix it in its own space and time, and all its single facts in their own places and periods." Instead of verifying his theory of the understanding by these concessions, he thus confutes it.

He next proceeds to that of the Reason, to which he assigns a wholly different sphere. He says:—

"A *higher light* than consciousness gives space and time, as *primitive intuition*; and from this *à priori* position as condition for all sense, it is competent to *oversee* the whole province of the sense, and determine all the conditions which make perception in sense possible. . . . In this higher light of the reason we have examined all the conditions of the sense, and determined how a sense is possible to be, by an organ altogether higher than any which sense can use.

"So also the faculty of the understanding connects phenomena in things, and things in conclusive judgments; and thereby attains to a knowledge of nature as a connected whole. . . . But in a higher light than any judgment of the understanding, the *pure notions* of substance, cause, and reciprocal influence for determining phenomena in space and time have been attained, and thus all the province of

the understanding has been readily *overseen*, and all the conditions which make an understanding possible determined. The understanding could not bring within its judgments the conditions of its own judging, but the whole has been brought within the demonstrated comprehension of a higher faculty.

"In the use of reason we have thus come to a science of both the sense and the understanding. In the sense we *perceive*, in the understanding we *judge*; but in the reason we have *overseen* both the process of perceiving and the process of judging. The same intellect in the capacity of the sense *envisages*, in the capacity of the understanding *substantiates*, and in the capacity of the reason *supervises*. The sense distinguishes quality, and *conjoins* quantity: the understanding connects phenomena; the reason *comprehends* the whole operation of both."—Pp. 532–534.

The sphere of the reason, he holds, is the supersensible, or immaterial existences.

"Whatever is neither a pure nor an empirical object, neither mathematical figure nor phenomenon of either external or internal sense, cannot be object in common consciousness, but must be revealed, if known at all, in the light of a higher organ than anything in the sense. *This is the Reason*; and concerning its cognitions we sometimes say, to express our conviction of their differences from any perception of sense, that we have them in our mind's eye. . . . The functions of sense, and of an understanding judging according to sense, the animal as well as the man may possess and exercise, but no animal can take these operations and separate the *à priori* conditions from the products, and distinguish space and time from the objects which appear in them, and substance and cause from the qualities and events which they connect, and thus overlook in a higher light the whole process of perceiving and of judging, and expound the whole as demonstrated science.

"In the sense we attained the process for constructing phenomena; in the understanding we likewise attained the process for connecting phenomena in nature: we must now seek the process for comprehending *universal nature*. This demands that we get for nature an origin and an end, and thus some existence above nature, and reaching beyond nature.

"This *à priori* condition, for all comprehension, we will here term, in distinction from primitive intuition, and also from pure notion, *the pure Ideal*. What this *à priori* condition is, which, when attained, we shall term the pure Ideal, we may now defer to a more

favorable point for consideration, and need only say here, that it must be the *supernatural*. It is essential that we transcend space and time, and also substance and cause, and find a position not merely *à priori* to phenomena, and *à priori* to the connexion of phenomena in things, but also *à priori* to substance in its causality through which nature is connected. We must be able to stand intelligently and firmly on the *supernatural*, and which will be a pure Ideal.

"The necessity of such an *à priori* process is seen in the very proposition to be expounded. That nature must have an *author and a governor*, is wholly a synthetical proposition. No analysis can get from nature this, that it must have an author. That nature must have substance, cause, and reciprocity of influence, is analytical, and each of these may be taken from the very conception of nature, and added as distinct predicate in an analytical judgment, and such would be the only author and governor which an understanding could find for nature. When put to the task of attaining a Deity, the understanding must, from the very law of its functions, give to us some compound of physical substance and cause; and hard and long has thus been the labor to get the conception of a Divinity from an analysis of nature, but in every result it has been, as it ever must be, nature still. It is a synthesis, and not an analysis, that is demanded. A god of nature must be found above and independent of nature, and be wholly a new conception to be added to the conception of nature, in the proposition that he is nature's author. The *à priori* process is for the same reason necessary here, as in the idea of the sense, or of the understanding. . . . We must now find in a conception of one whole of space and of time to be transcended and comprehended in a pure ideal, which as wholly unconditioned to the form of space and of time may circumscribe nature in its own space and time, and as the maker of nature may be the *compass for comprehending* how both nature and nature's space and time may begin together and end together. Such a process of comprehending nature will be a complete attainment of the reason in the ideal. We must then find facts in colligation by a Law, which is the correlative of this idea, and we shall thus possess a science of the Reason. An Ontological Demonstration of the real being of the Soul and God may then follow."—Pp. 541–546.

The office of the Reason thus is, according to him, to account for the universe, which is the object of the senses and the understanding, by the discovery and demonstration of a supersensual author and governor. This author

and governor he denominates the Absolute—or Unconditioned.

"This author of nature must thus stand free from all conditions imposed *ab extra*, even from those of an internal force, which as action and reaction would demand that he be a composite being. His only conditions must be such as are self-imposed in the dignity of his own transcendent unity. It is not thus an unconditioned which is given in *abstraction*—merely cutting off all occasion for changes and successions above, and assuming a source and cause for all below—this the space-filling force and substance of nature itself is. It must be a *positive, and intelligently affirmed Unconditioned*, whose only end of action is found by himself in his own being. Such alone can stand above nature, and condition nature, without the reciprocity of a conditioning back upon himself from nature. As thus positively unconditioned, we give to this conception of a super-natural being, the high name, which must be his own prerogative and incommunicable possession—THE ABSOLUTE.

"The whole problem of the reason, therefore, is seen to be in this determination of the Absolute."—Pp. 560, 561.

In his attempt to solve this problem, however, as in his theory of sense and the understanding, he falls into the most extraordinary and palpable errors, that subvert and confound his whole system.

In the first place, he builds his attempted solution of this problem on the assumption that the universe for which an author and governor is to be discovered and demonstrated, is a real external material universe, like that in all respects which, according to consciousness, is the object of the senses; and thence completely deserts therein the theory which he presents in his *Psychology of the sense and the understanding*, that it is only an ideal or conceptional universe that exists nowhere except in the mind of the percipient. Thus it is that veritable universe of which our planet, the other orbs of our system, and the countless glittering spheres that fill the realms of space, are members, for the existence of which he undertakes to account. He says:—

"This ideal of the absolute is to be the compass for comprehending *nature*, as the notional was the medium for connecting phenomena in a *nature of things*. In this we are to determine how it may be known, as a *synthetical proposition*, that



*nature must have its author, as in that it was determined how it might be demonstrated that phenomena must be inherent in substance, adherent in cause, and coherent in reciprocal influence. The phenomena were in distinct and definite places and periods, and could not be determined in one whole of space, and all times in one whole of time. In this manner the phenomena in the sense, and the things and events in the understanding, came very well to be united, and the passage from the sense to the understanding was effected, and the synthetical propositions—all qualities must have substance; all events must have cause; all concomitant events must have reciprocity of influence—came to be readily demonstrated, when, without such à priori demonstration, they could only be used as assumptions. And now the same result of an à priori demonstration of a synthetical proposition is to be determined, but with this difference, the conceptions of the phenomena and the things were, the one in the sense, and the other in the understanding; while here the conceptions of the nature of things and of an author of nature are, the one in the understanding, and the other in the reason.”—Pp. 563, 564.*

“The Deity needs but to will the counteraction in its perpetual force, and *universal nature* finds its equilibrium in the repulsion from the centre and the reflex pressure to the centre, and holds itself suspended on its own conditioned forces, without the possibility of any weariness or exhaustion to its maker. It is wholly the product of the Divine will, and wholly *external to the absolute*; and while utterly dependent for its being upon the Divine will, can yet never react upon, or in any way condition, the being and agency of the omnipotent producer. It is thereby a *veritable creation*, distinct from its creator, of which it may intelligently be affirmed, that the creator is conditional for it, but it in no wise conditions the creator.”—P. 610.

The universe for which he is to account, is thus a real material one, consisting of substances, causes, effects, and phenomena, precisely such as the veritable exterior universe is to our consciousness in our sense-perceptions. The universe, however, for which he is to find an author, according to his theory of the sense and understanding, is not an exterior and material, but a mere conceptional or mental one, having no existence except in the mind of the perceptive, and vanishing from being, therefore, whenever it ceases to be the object of conception. He maintains, on the one hand, that there is no perception of any external objects

by the senses; that all the various things perceived through them are mere phenomena in the mind that apprehends them, and that have, so far as our knowledge extends, no counterpart without; while on the other, he holds that the substances which are the seeming grounds of those phenomena, are merely conceptional, and have no exterior existence. The "nature," or universe of things, of which he attempts to find an author, is not, therefore, the nature and universe of his psychology of the senses and the understanding, but a wholly different entity. It is an external material universe that exists independently of the mind that perceives it, not a mere process or modification of the mind itself. This is surely extraordinary, and indicates that Dr. Hickok is but very imperfectly master of his own system.

In the second place : The mind does not feel any necessity for finding a divine author of such a mere conceptional universe, as that which his psychology contemplates. It is the real external universe which it is conscious it perceives by its senses, for which it feels itself constrained to find a divine author. It knows nothing of any other universe, or of the want of a creator and ruler of any other universe.

Dr. Hickok has thus here gone completely out of the sphere of rational psychology, and is dealing both with a world and with a reason that has no existence in his own system. How happens this? How is it that after exhausting, as he obviously has, all the resources of his ingenuity, so to frame his system as to make its several parts cohere, he has not only failed, but has lost himself in a labyrinth of blunders and self-contradictions ?

In the third place : If the universe were such a merely ideal one as his theory represents, it is not possible that the mind could feel such a need as it does of a God to account for its existence. It is a self-contradiction to suppose that reason, contemplating the universe as purely conceptional, existing only in the mind of the concipient, should still feel a necessity of finding a Divine author to account for its existence as a real material universe existing exterior to and independent of the mind that perceives it ! It would imply that the reason is utterly bewildered and delirious : at one time contemplating the objects about which it employs itself, as having a wholly different nature from that which

it ascribes to them at another, and confounding the real and material with the merely imaginary, and the imaginary with the real and material. Besides, if, as Dr. H. maintains, the mind itself is the cause of all the phenomena that take place in it, and of the consciousness which attends those of the senses that they are perceptions of external objects, why should it feel a necessity of accounting for those seeming exterior objects, as though they were not mere mental phenomena, but had an external and independent existence? Why, while ascribing to them a nature and sphere of one kind, should it also ascribe to them a wholly different nature and sphere? It is plain, that were Dr. H.'s theory true, the only thing to account for which the mind would need a Divine author, would be itself. After having assigned to *itself* the authorship of all else that belongs to its universe, the ground of its own existence and nature would be the only problem which would require to be solved. He thus, in this part of his system, contradicts his theory of the nature of the mind, as well as his theory of the nature of the universe.

In the fourth place : The ground on which he assumes or maintains the existence of God as creator, is the same as that of philosophers and theologians generally, that reason discerns from the nature of the universe that just such a being must have been its author. The pretence that his is any more an *à priori* demonstration than theirs, is mistaken. Thus he says :—

“ As we found the very essence of substance in its causality to be a space-filling and time-enduring *force*, and that as counter-agency it filled its place in space from a permanent centre, and might thus determine all places in its own space, and also as enduring centre it might thus determine all periods in its own time ; *so now* we must find the very essence of the Absolute to be a spaceless and timeless *personality*, who, as above all modes of expansion in space and duration in time, may be not nature, but supernatural ; not thing but person. If conditioned to the one whole of nature, of space, and of time, thus it must be of the substance and causality of nature, and can never be the Divinity above nature. No matter whether all of the phenomenal be abstracted from it or not ; in naked substance and cause it is but pure force, space-occupying and time-abiding, and must react upon nature and nature upon it, and the compound thus

afforded must still be nature altogether. And no matter whether it be carried above all phenomena; it is then free force in its antagonism at the centre, and as undeveloped, must yet go out in development, and such is only nature in its rudimental germ, and not at all nature's author and God. *Except as we determine the absolute to be personality wholly out of and beyond all the conditions and modes of space and time, we can by no possibility leave nature for the supernatural.* The clear-sighted and honest intellect resting in this conclusion, that the conditions of space and time cannot be transcended, will be Atheistic; while the deluded intellect, which has put the false play of the discursive understanding in its abstract speculations for the decisions of an all-embracing reason, and deems itself so fortunate as to have found a deity within the modes of space and time, will be Pantheistic. The Pantheism will be ideal and transcendent, when it reaches its conclusions by a logical process in the abstract law of thought; and it will be material and empiric when it concludes from the fixed connexions of cause and effect in the generalized law of nature; but in neither case is the Pantheism any other than Atheism, for the Deity, circumscribed in the conditions of space and time with nature, is but nature still, and whether in abstract thought or generalized reality, is no God.

"This determination of personality to the Absolute, and which takes it out from all the modes of space and time, *is the only possible way in which it may be demonstrated, how nature MAY HAVE an author, which author shall not be nature still, and yet demanding for itself an author.* In such a pure ideal as the Absolute in its personality, a compass is given by which the reason may comprehend nature, and the completed process of comprehension thus effected is a faculty of the reason in idea. This, therefore, is a necessary, and our next work, to determine personality to the Absolute. This will give all the necessary elements in the work of comprehension."—Pp. 564–566.

The whole reason which he here gives for conceiving of God, the author of the universe, as a pure personal and spiritual being, thus is, that such a being alone can have created the universe: and in this he proceeds on the assumption, that the worlds are an effect and must have had a cause: that that cause must be an intelligent, spiritual, and free agent: and that he must be self-existent, almighty, and all-wise. But that is precisely the argument of Locke, and other writers of that class, in proof of the being of God. Its principle is like that of Paley also, except that Paley rea-

sons chiefly from design, which is but one species of the proof furnished by the material world, that God is its author. Paley argues, however, from the nature of the effect, as indicating design, that its author must be of a different nature from the effect itself, and a pure and infinite intelligence. Dr. Hickok's argument also is, simply, that a cause of the same kind as the universe itself, cannot be the cause of the universe: and, therefore, its cause must have been of a wholly different nature, and a personal, self-existing, infinite, and free intelligence. The fancy that his argument is any more an *a priori* argument than that of Paley, Locke, and others, is a mere delusion.

His argument, however, though just and conclusive on their view of the universe, is wholly impertinent and worthless on his: for the universe for which he in fact employs his *a priori* method to find an author, is a veritable material universe; while the universe of his psychology is a mere conceptional one. If he finds, therefore, an adequate cause of such a universe as Locke, Paley, and men generally, believe to exist, he finds none whatever for such a mere ideal world as his own system contemplates. How is it that with the discriminative powers which he exhibits in some parts of his work, he failed to see a fact so important and obvious as this?

In the fifth place: He falls into a similar contradiction to his own argument and to fact, in his representation that no reasoning from causation or design in the material world, or any phenomena of matter that are perceived by the senses, can conclude legitimately for the being of God, or any other supersensual existence. After defining the sphere in which he holds that the senses and the understanding are confined, he says:—

“But that there are the functions of a higher faculty in action, is quite manifest from the earnest inquiry spontaneously and perpetually coming up—*Whence is nature? And whither does it tend?*”

“There are the straggings of a faculty within, whose interest it is to overleap nature, and which may never be made contented by running up and down the linked series in the conditions of nature. Discursive thinking up to the highest generalization, and down to the lowest analysis, cannot satisfy. No possible conclusion in a discursive judgment, whether in the abstract or the concrete, can fill this

craving capacity. There is demanded for it a position out of and above the flowing stream of conditioned changes, whence may be seen the unconditioned source in which they have all originated, and the strong and steady hand that holds all suspended from itself, and gives to them their direction towards some ultimate consummation. But this instinct of the higher faculty always exceeds the capabilities of the lower to satisfy. . . . The aspirings of this higher faculty, and the efforts of the inferior to reach and satisfy it, throw the human mind upon a treadmill, which forces it to a perpetual and vain toil, compelling to a continual stepping, while each stair must ever slide away beneath, and disappoint the hope of any permanent landing-place. We can in this way find no link in the series which will permit that it should be taken in the judgment as the origin of all others, and itself unoriginated from a higher; and if we assume that there must be such somewhere at the head of the series, this is merely because the higher faculty demands some ultimate point upon which all are dependent, but which is only assumed to be, and never reached, because the lower faculty can never attain unto it.

"This endless search is also just as empty labor in the conditioned series of *design* as in that of *causation*. Design indicates a designer; but when we seize upon this conceived designer as condition for the produced design, we find it adapted to the making of just such products, and this adaptation at once becomes a conditioned, demanding for itself A HIGHER DESIGNER, of which it must be a product. Whence is the independent unconditioned spring of all design? This is the question which the interest of the higher faculty asks, and is ever seeking that it should be answered, but which all the tasking of the functions of the lower faculty can never accomplish. We may assume there is such underived designer, because the interest of the reason as faculty cannot else be quieted; but we are forced to stop and rest in a mere assumption, making our very want the only evidence of a real existence, while it is impossible to bring it within the conclusion of any discursive judgment. If, on the one hand, reason objects the absurdity of an endless series, so, on the other hand, the understanding objects the impossibility of taking any position from which it must not still ask—What next? Whence is this? And what is above it?

"An interminable dialectic is thus opened from the very faculties of the human mind, and all attempt to stop the demand in the interest of the reason, that we should somehow issue out of nature, and find its author and governor, is in vain; and all effort in any possible use of the functions of an understanding to meet the demand, is equally in vain. The reason is too enterprising to submit to any

circumscription within nature; the understanding is too limited in its capacity to be able that it should ever unbar the gate and point the way to the supernatural. The discursive faculty must ever keep within the conditions of the space and time determinations, and must, therefore, ever pass through the connective notions of substance, cause, and reciprocal influence, in connecting its judgments; and that which may not be brought within the conditions of such connexions, must for ever, to it, be not merely the unattainable, but the utterly unintelligible. We are thus forced to dispense, in this part of our work, with all use of the understanding, and can see, that if the supernatural may in any manner be attained, it must be in the use of the reason only. The faculty in whose interest the want originates, must rely upon its own resources alone to attain to that which may satisfy it. It is its own operation for *comprehending* universal nature that we wish to attain in a complete and systematic process, and thus possess the entire faculty of the reason in its idea. In this we shall find how it is possible that a nature of things may be comprehended; and, according to which, if in fact this ever is done, nature necessarily must be comprehended."—Pp. 548–552.

He thus affirms and founds his argument for the view he is to present of the evidence of the divine existence: first, on the assertion, that no limited or finite effect can indicate the existence of any more than a finite cause; and second, that design can only prove a designer of a conditioned or finite nature like itself; and thence, that no causation, or design in the material world, is any proof of a deity. And it is on this ground that he holds, that if God is an object of knowledge, it must be by the reason, according to his definition of it, through some other media, than the material world. But this is equivalent to affirming that there are no media whatever by which God can be known. For, first, if no limited causation can bespeak the existence of more than a finite and limited cause proportioned to itself, then, inasmuch as all causation in nature is finite, and that which lies within the observation of any one individual is still more limited than the universe itself is, it is clear that no individual can have any evidence of an infinite being. The being whose existence what he sees of causation in the realms of nature indicates, can only be proportionate in attributes to the displays of them which he witnesses. It implies, moreover, that no finite effect can be produced by any but a

finite cause; and that an infinite being can never cause any but infinite effects, which would make it certain, again, that no finite being can have a knowledge of God—errors and absurdities that cannot easily be exceeded in extravagance. A finite effect, such as the creation of a plant, an animal, a human being, a world, or the working of a miracle, as the restoration of sight to the blind, and of life to the dead, is as real and absolute a proof of God's being and agency, though not as great in degree, as the creation of many plants, animals, human beings, and worlds. Otherwise they are no proofs at all of his being and agency. For if the nature of those effects does not demonstrate that they are the work of God, the fact that they are produced on a great scale cannot.

In like manner, if design in the realms of nature can only prove a designer that is adapted by his powers to the production of such finite effects, and that must itself therefore be as finite and dependent as they are; then none of the designs with which men are acquainted can be a proof of the Deity, inasmuch as they are all finite. It implies, moreover, on the one hand, that no being can produce a finite design but one who is himself as finite as the effect is to which he gives existence; and on the other, that an infinite being can produce no work of design except such as is as infinite as he himself is—absurdities as vast and startling as those of his notions of causation. A finite design, however, such as that which is seen in the structure of a plant, an animal, or a human being, is in fact as real and conclusive a proof, though not as great in degree, that its author has infinite attributes, as innumerable such designs are, or a universe of them; inasmuch as if the *nature* itself of design does not prove an intelligent and voluntary author, no scale on which it is exhibited can form such a proof.

The notion he here advances and repeats on almost every page, and makes the basis, in a great measure, of his system, that nothing in the material or phenomenal world is, or ever can be, the medium of a direct perception of the supersensual, is an equally palpable and extraordinary error, and bespeaks a surprising inconsideration of the bearing of his theory on the most obvious, important, and delightful facts of consciousness and observation. Had Dr. Hickok been



born without sight, hearing, or touch, he could scarcely have betrayed a more singular disregard of the phenomena of those senses. A blind and deaf person who had never received any instruction, might innocently and naturally remain ignorant that there is a direct and vivid perception through the eye and ear of the supersensual in fellow-beings: but that a philosopher who is in possession of perfect senses, and has spent his days in the observation and study of our nature, should not only not discover, but formally and strenuously deny it, and make the denial a leading element of his psychological theory, may justly move our wonder and laughter.

There are several most extensive classes of phenomena that are direct manifestations and expressions of the supersensual, and have in that their special and sole office. Such are the various modifications of the human countenance, in form, color, and air, which are occasioned by the excited thoughts and feelings of the mind, and are indices and expressions of those feelings and thoughts. The countenance is so formed that every movement of energetic and impassioned thought, and every pulse and hue of emotion and affection, is instantly painted on it in colors so vivid and distinguishing, that no eye can fail to see their presence and character. Kind feeling, pleasure, delight, love, in their ten thousand forms and degrees, reveal themselves in smiles. A contortion of the brow, and flash of the eye, are the signals of anger. Tears are the symbol of grief, pallor of fear, blushes of modesty and shame; and a dark, fixed, and drooping countenance of sadness and despair. Bright, lofty, exhilarating thoughts, light up the aspect with intelligence and expression. Dark and distressful musings cast a shadow over it: and thus every shade of intelligence, and tint of feeling, gives an impress to the face, which is its symbol and expression. And this is the designed and sole office of these modifications of the features. They have no other meaning, and answer no other end. Were it not for the index which they form of the actings of the soul within, they would be as meaningless as the ripples that sweep along the surface of running water, or the shifting attitudes of the crops of summer which surging winds are swaying to and fro. And the office which they thus fill, is a most exten-

sive and important one. Of all the functions of which our physical nature is capable, there is no other at once so delicate, so beautiful, so expressive, so grand, and that seems so manifestly to be the work of an indwelling spirit. There is no other that fills so vast and so delightful an office in the excitement, evolution, and nurture of the gentle and amiable affections of the heart, and gift to them of the softening and refining sway which they exert in the domestic and social sphere. Were it debarred from the countenance; were the power of revealing through it the exhilaration, the delight, the love, the joy, that throbs in our breasts, struck from our nature, we should be turned into rigid statues; the heart would be buried in almost absolute concealment; love, joy, hope, and every form of benignant affection, would themselves seem to be swept from our breasts, and the race be reduced to the level of brutes.

- The voice also fills a similar office. There not only are many utterances, such as sighs, groans, cries, and laughter, whose sole function is the expression of mental feeling: but the whole office of speech is to utter thoughts, emotions, desires, and acts of the will. It has no other sphere: and were it divested of that beautiful function, it would be as devoid of any end as the confused din of a workshop, or the senseless clamor of a family of rooks or frogs. And it fills that office. There is not a shape of thought or fancy that flits through the intellect, or a wave of emotion that sweeps over the heart, that may not be depicted by the tones of the voice with the most perfect accuracy.

Written and printed language fills the same office also. The letters are mere representatives of the simple sounds used in speech; and words are the representatives of the composite sounds, which are employed in the expression of particular thoughts and affections. The letters and their combinations in words, have, as mere forms, no significance whatever. Their only function is that of vehicles of the supersensual. The raised letters used by the blind are the medium, in like manner, through touch of expressions of the mind.

And these phenomena of sight, hearing, and touch, take place on a vast scale, and exert on us a boundless influence. There are no others with which we are so familiar; no others.

that make on us such deep, exciting, refining, and joyous impressions, nor that contribute so largely to unfold our intellectual powers, and awaken, exercise, and mould our social and moral feelings. Let them be struck from our natures, and we should scarcely rise in any respect above the higher class of animals. What would a mother be to her offspring, if she had not the power of smiling, or uttering her heart by her voice; if her features, swept of every trace of thought and feeling, were turned into a meaningless blank? What would offspring be to a mother, had they no power of responding to her love with smiles, and depicting on their countenances the ever-varying flashes of thought and emotion that gleam through their sympathetic minds? What would the world be, were there no written or spoken language; no method of expressing the thoughts, or giving utterance to the heart? Men would, at best, be but brutes. There would be no society above that which gregarious animals enjoy: no government, no laws, no domestic institutions, no culture, no systematic knowledge; no social worship, no revelation from God; religion, virtue, cultivation, science, domestic happiness, everything that distinguishes and dignifies man as a rational and moral being, would be struck from existence.

But besides these objects of sight, hearing, and touch, which are the direct vehicle of revealing and perceiving the supersensual, there is another almost equally large class that are indirect indices of the presence and activity, or the past agency of intelligences. Thus from consciousness and observation of our shape and modes of action, the sight, hearing, or touch of a human being, is the medium of the perception of the presence of an intelligence, of a nature like ourselves. And the sight of works of human labor, edifices, ships, engines, instruments, books, roads, cultured fields, crops, tamed animals, and every other object that bears the impress of man's hand, is the vehicle of a perception of the past presence and work of intelligent agents like ourselves.

The circle of the objects of our sense-perceptions, which are the vehicle either of a direct or an indirect revelation and apprehension of the supersensual, is therefore the most comprehensive, influential, and important that comes within

the sphere of the eye, the ear, or the touch. All others, indeed, are of little significance, compared to them.

We have thus the most indubitable and ample proof of Dr. Hickok's error, in maintaining that the phenomenal can never be the medium of a perception of the supersensual. It is one of the greatest and most preposterous blunders into which a metaphysician ever fell, and bespeaks an inattention to his own consciousness, and an ignorance of the office of the most important part of our perceptions, that reflect little credit on his powers as a philosopher.

The fact thus established that the supersensual, in place of lying, as he maintains, wholly out of the sphere of our senses, is the immediate object of a vast proportion of our sense-perceptions, prostrates accordingly his whole psychological system in the dust, and makes it certain that it can never be reconstructed. It overthrows, also, the theory of Kant, Coleridge, Schelling, Hegel, and the whole brood of modern atheists and pantheists, who build their systems on the denial of the reality of the objects of sense, and the possibility of a knowledge through the senses of the great objects of reason, God, and the Soul.

Such is Dr. Hickok's System of Rational Psychology. Instead of unfolding and establishing the great faculties and laws of our perceptive nature, his views of the sense and the understanding are totally mistaken, and his attempt to limit the office of the reason to the perception of supersensual objects, leaving the material world wholly unperceived, and substituting a train of mere conceptional existences in its place, is confuted, and confounded by the grossest self-contradictions, and the most portentous blunders. His work is in fact a mere reproduction of the idealism of Kant, with slight variations, and like that, involves a denial of the external universe, and of the possibility of a knowledge of the existence of God, or any other intelligence, through the medium of what we perceive by the senses. The most important particular in which it differs from Kant's Critic of Pure Reason, is that Dr. H. endeavors to conceal from his readers this atheistic feature, and inspire the belief that it presents the only true and effective demonstration of the divine Being. Kant openly avowed his disbelief of the reality of the seeming objects of our senses; and admitted

and affirmed that, on the principles of his system, there could be no proof of God, or the soul. Dr. Hickok has striven to veil this element of his system; and while he maintains in the clearest manner, that nothing whatever out of the mind itself is perceived either by the senses or the understanding; yet frames a large share of his language throughout his volume in such a manner as to betray his readers into the impression that he truly believes in the existence of the material world, and founds, as we have shown, many of the most important of his assertions and reasonings respecting the functions of the reason on that assumption.

The *à priori* method which he employs for the establishment of his idea and law of the senses, the understanding, and the reason, has no title to the high office which he assigns it; and is in fact, so far as the points he attempts to prove by it are valid, a most obscure, round-about, cumbersome method of demonstration, and cannot, by possibility, rise in certainty above the testimony of the senses, which he treats in it as wholly without authority. For his *à priori* demonstrations, depend, he admits, for their validity, on the truth and reliability of consciousness. But the verity of the *à priori* processes which he employs is no more a matter of indubitable consciousness, than our perception of the external world by our senses is. We are as perfectly conscious that we see the objects of our senses as existences that are exterior to, and independent of us, as we are that those objects are in space, and have qualities and dimensions. The very principle, therefore, by which he aims to prove that all the phenomena of the senses and the understanding are comprised within certain categories, proves with equal certainty, that the objects of our sense-perceptions have a veritable existence without us, and overthrows, accordingly, the whole of his system.

His work has no title then to be considered as presenting a just view of our perceptive faculties. Instead, it is false in all its main positions, presents a consummate caricature of our nature, in place of a just picture of it, and tends, whether consciously to the author or not, to the subversion, instead of the establishment of religion. While he often exhibits strong powers, and presents many views that are

just and important, the consummate contradictions to our consciousness, which lurk in every part of his work, show that instead of having carefully and thoroughly investigated our nature, he has not even cast a solitary glance at it in independence of the speculative system of Kant: he has only studied *his* artificial, narrow, and mistaken Critic, without inquiring into the validity of the assumptions on which it rests, or rising to a just and comprehensive view of its nature.

We cannot, then, recommend this as a suitable work to be put into the hands of the young. The experiment of seventy years in Europe has shown, that the principles which it inculcates lead directly to scepticism. They were there taught in essentially the same form as that in which they are here presented; the infidelity, atheism, and pantheism, that have overrun Europe during the last fifty years, had their chief origin in them: and their dissemination here will naturally produce the same effects. It is not to be regretted, perhaps, that the extreme obscurity of the volume, and the insupportable tediousness of many of its disquisitions, must prove a barrier to its being extensively read. Not one in a score who attempt it, will ever go through its pages. Not one in a hundred of those who may read it with much attention, will be able to comprehend what he is at, in many of his passages. It lies out of the sphere of nature, is artificial, dim, and cumbrous; tallying nowhere with consciousness, and deriving no support from the facts and thoughts with which we are familiar, but perpetually making assumptions of what is false, and rejections of what is true; and as perpetually mystifying and confounding himself, by abandoning what he had assumed, and retracting what he had denied.

We invite our metaphysical readers especially, to notice the great points we regard as settled in this review. We are frequently asked, How shall we refute the psychological system of the modern German Atheists, whose doctrines are adopted by many of the leading teachers of mental philosophy in this country, and are rapidly spreading among the educated, and generating scepticism, atheism, or pantheism, in every mind that intelligently embraces them? The answer is furnished, we trust, in the points we have established.

1. The theory of the senses, on which the system is built—as involving no perception of objects that are external to the mind,—is gratuitously assumed. Not an attempt even is made to demonstrate its truth.

2. That theory is in the most absolute and palpable contradiction to our consciousness, and can never be acted on as true by any one for a moment.

3. There is no such faculty in our nature as that which it denominates the understanding, but the office assigned to that fabulous attribute is in contradiction to our consciousness.

4. Its doctrine that there is no direct perception through the senses or the objects of the senses, of supersensual things,—as of the soul, of fellow intelligences, and of God—is in the most flagrant and absurd contradiction to every one's consciousness, and the whole train of our most frequent, exciting, and gladdening perceptions. It is refuted by every smile that lights up the human countenance, every blush that kindles it, every frown that darkens it, every passion and emotion that embodies itself in its ever-varying shapes, and paints itself in its ever-shifting hues. It is confuted by every accent of the voice, by every significant gesture, by every creation of man's genius, by every product of his labor, and by every monument and foot-print of his activity: for, according to Kant and his disciples, there is no more significance in a blush of shame than there is in the same hue as it is seen in the rose, the oleander, or other flowers of a brilliant scarlet. There is no more meaning in the paleness of fear and dismay, than in the same sickly tint as it is seen in a diseased or withered plant. The human countenance, when glowing with the most stirring thoughts and joyous emotions, is no more indicative of the presence and activity of an intelligent spirit, than the cold, rigid, and senseless features of the dead. And that revolting dogma, which sinks us below the brutes in sensibility, must be assented to by those who aspire to be philosophers after the pattern of Kant, Coleridge, Schelling, Hegel, and Hickok.

5. The pretext that the system has the peculiar advantage over that to which it stands opposed, that it is demonstrated by *a priori* evidence, is wholly mistaken. The validity of

that *à priori* demonstration depends, it is admitted, on the testimony of consciousness. But, in the first place, the testimony of consciousness to the facts alleged as evidences of the system, admitting them to be real, is no more indubitable and emphatic, than it is to the fact that our sense-perceptions are perceptions of objects that are external to us, which the system denies. Their *à priori* proof, therefore, cannot possibly rise to a higher measure of certainty than is furnished by consciousness, that a material and intellectual universe exists without us, and, therefore, that the system is false. But in the second place, not one of the facts on which the *à priori* demonstration of the system is founded, forms any proof of the truth of the system itself. Instead, they are mere facts, that, while they are consistent with its falsehood, are also perfectly consistent with our consciousness respecting our sense-perceptions, which the system denies. Thus, Dr. H., in his *à priori* demonstration of his doctrine of the senses, simply proves that quantity and quality are perceptible by the senses. He does not demonstrate that there is not also a perception by them of external objects to which quantity and quality belong. He does not prove nor offer any indication that nothing is seen in a smile but figure and color: that nothing is discerned in a blush except a certain conformation of the features and certain tints. His *à priori* proof, accordingly, is no proof at all of the truth of his Psychology. These points, properly understood, will enable one easily to refute the system.

#### ART. II.—NOTES ON SCRIPTURE. CRITICAL CONJECTURES.

*Math. xii. 20.* Till he send forth judgment unto victory — *ἵνα ἂν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νίκας τὴν κρίσιν*, i. e. according to most interpreters, till he has made his gospel and righteous law victorious (Whitby). Yet the translators differ greatly.

The obscurity arises from translating *εἰς νίκας* too literally, and *ἐκβάλῃ* not enough so, in order to suit their sense to a signification of *κρίσις*, which it has in no other place. *Ἐκβαλλω* signifies (ejicio, expello) *to cast out, expel*. It occurs thrice in



this chapter (vs. 26, 27, 28) in that sense, and is commonly so rendered, and might have been so rendered with good if not better effect in Matt. ix. 25, 28; xii. 35. Mark i. 12.—*Eis vñas* is a Hebraism, and signifies (*eis aivna*, in perpetuum) *completely, utterly, for ever* (see Glassius Phil. Sac. 1935. Whitby on 1 Cor. xv. 54; 2 Sam. ii. 26; Job xxxvi. 7; Jer. iii. 5; Lam. v. 20; Amos viii. 7, in the LXX. Grinfield's N. T. Ed. Hellenistica in loco, and Brenton's Septuagint). Thus we understand (1 Cor. xv. 55) *κατιρώσθαι ὁ θάνατος εἰς vñas* to signify, "Death is swallowed up for ever," i. e. *utterly and for ever abolished* (Rev. xxi. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 26). *Εκβάλλει eis vñas*, then, signifies (*ejicere, expellere in perpetuum*) *to cast out for ever, or to cast out utterly, entirely, and for ever*. The word *κρίσις* has several significations, but its primary or fundamental meaning is, a judgment or sentence pronounced concerning a person or thing, and commonly in the condemnatory sense of *damnatio* or *pœna* (see Jer. xlviii. 21, and Wahl and Schleusner, for examples). In the passage under consideration, these lexicographers assign to the word the sense of *justitia, doctrina vera, justa, vel Divina*; though they admit that this is the only place in the N. T. where it bears that sense (*sæpius non extat—non legitur—in N. T.*), which is a reason for cautious admission, if not suspicion; and the greater, because incompatible with the usual (not to say any known and well ascertained) meaning of the words in connexion.

Let us adopt for a moment the usual signification of a *condemnatory sentence or judgment*. The question then arises, what sentence or judgment the Evangelist refers to. Notice, first, the article (*τῆς κρίσεως*), *the judgment*. In our version, the article is not translated, though it serves to define the meaning. Observe, secondly, that the judgment spoken of is closely connected with the Redeemer's work. It must therefore be something wide-spread, general, if not quite commensurate therewith. Those who understand it to signify the present dispensation of the gospel, or the spread of the true religion, adopt this idea. Now, one such judgment has already been pronounced. This lower creation has travailed and groaned under its bondage six thousand years. Its effects are visible in the thorn and istle, as well as in the mortality of the whole race. The

day when this judgment was pronounced, was truly a day of judgment and of condemnation (*ἡμερα κρίσεως*), though not of condemnation without hope (Gen. iii. 14–19; Rom. viii. 20–22). To this judgment, Michaelis (see *Notæ Criticæ et Exegeticæ* in N. T.) refers the word (*κρίσεως*) in John xii. 31, though he confines its application, perhaps unduly, to that part of it which had respect to the Serpent. If to this judgment, especially to its moral and physical effects upon man and the earth itself for man's sake, we refer the word judgment (*κρίσεως*) in this passage, we obtain this sense—"till he cast out the curse,"\* that is, the moral and physical effects of that sentence which God pronounced against man at his fall—"utterly and for ever." That this is one of the great purposes of the incarnation may be proved by many parts of Scripture—(see Rev. xxi. 2, 3, 4; xxii. 3; Matt. xix. 28; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Is. lxv. 17; lxvi. 22). And why may not this be the purpose referred to in this place?

This interpretation gives the obvious and full effect to every word of the clause under consideration, and harmonizes it with the context. The bruised reed and the dimly-burning flax are emblems of the church of this dispensation, or, if you please, of the members composing it. His church, the Redeemer will preserve, though in a suffering, oppressed, afflicted condition, until the day of redemption (*εἰς ἡμῶν ἀπαλυστῆσιν*), when he will cast out of the world its usurping prince (John xii. 31; Rev. xx. 2, 3), and the curse and its effects, which are the strength of his power, and make all things new (Rev. xxi. 5)—the former things—(those, *namely*, of the times of the first Adam, or the dispensation of the curse)—having passed away (Rev. xxi. 4). According to this interpretation of the passage, the *exodus* of the church from the state of depression and suffering to glory and power will be instantaneous, like that of its adorable and ever glorious Head (see Phil. iii. 10; John xvi. 33; 2 Tim. iii. 12).

It remains to explain how the Evangelist could extract this sense from the Heb. original *לְאַחַת יוֹצִיא מִשְׁפָּט*. The

---

\* The cause for the effect—no unusual figure in Scripture. Pa. cv. 7; 1 Chron. xvi. 14; Ps. xxxvi. 6; Is. xxvi. 9; Zeph. iii. 15.

following suggestions occur: The LXX. translate אָרֶץ (in Hiph.) by ἰκβαλλω in 2 Chron. xxiii. 14, and xxix. 5, 16. It may be so rendered in this place consistently with the sense in which the Evangelist interpreted the rest of the phrase. The article (τῇ κρίσει) is used exegetically, that is, to distinguish the judgment (מִשְׁפָּט κρίσις) intended by the prophet, from the ordinary punitive judgments of God. Zeph. iii. 15 (see original Hebrew) is full authority for such an application of *mishphat*. Zion's judgments are taken away *when the Lord appears* in her midst. She sees evil no more. In this respect the expression of the Evangelist is more precise than that of the prophet. One use of the article in Greek is to designate an object of which there is but one (as ὁ θεός, ὁ γῆ). If the inspired prophet referred to that first great judicial transaction, by which death and all physical evils entered the world, marring its original beauty and excellence, the Evangelist supplied the article in conformity with this rule. Schott (cited by Tholuck on John i. 9) has shown that τὸ αἰώνιον, in the evangelical sense, denotes "that which may be depended on"—i. e. things stable, permanent, enduring, not destined to be changed—a sense borrowed undoubtedly from the Heb. אָמֵן (aman) which signifies *firmity, constitutio firma*, as well as *veritas*. (See Gussetius *ad vocem*.) The allusion of the prophet then, as understood by the Evangelist, is to that order of things which God has appointed to succeed the present;—to the new heavens and new earth which shall remain (Is. lxvi. 22). The heavens and the earth which now are, God is not well pleased with. They are not what he made them. Their scheme and fashion are to pass away (τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου) παραγί, 1 Cor. vii. 31; 2 Pet. iii. 10) in order to a new constitution of all things—a *παλιγγενεσία*—which will never be shaken or moved (Heb. xii. 26, 28). To this grand consummation these words of the prophet point, and so do the words of the evangelist. Yet αἰς ὕμνος is not a translation of אֱמָנָה, although, as connected with ἰκβαλλω, the expressions of the prophet and evangelist are equivalent;—because the perpetual expulsion of the curse (ἡ κρίσις ἡ πρώτη), and its effects, is immediately and inseparably connected in the purpose of God with that new order or constitution of things, in which there shall be never a sin nor a curse. It should be noticed,

also, that instead of the adversative ἀλλὰ supplied by the LXX., the evangelist employs ἵνα αὖ to denote the *terminus ad quem*—the limit or result to which the Redeemer's work is tending—another proof that we are to regard him as the inspired interpreter of the prophet, rather than his translator.

After all, we shall not enter fully into the conception of the evangelist, unless we consider together those two great acts of Divine judgment which mark, so to speak, the beginning and completion of the mystery of redemption (see Rev. x. 7; Rom. v. 18, 6, 12). In one sense (and just so far as the redemption *shall not take effect*), the last judgment (ἡ κρίσις ἡ δευτέρα—ἡ κρίσις μεγάλης ἡμέρας, Jude 6) may be regarded as a continuation of the first—(ἡ κρίσις ἡ πρώτη). But why, we may ask, was not the *first* judgment the *final* judgment? The answer is found in the purpose of redemption. God dealt not with sinning man as he did with the angels who kept not their first estate. The interposition of God the Redeemer, mitigated and suspended the effects of the curse for a time, in respect to all which came under its power, in order to make space for the execution of the proposed scheme of redemption. Hence, man is represented in the Scriptures as condemned already, as dead, as lying under the wrath of God, in consequence, or as the effect of this first judgment, yet withal as a prisoner of hope. The earth itself, too, like man, its rightful lord, is represented as travailing and groaning under this first punitive sentence (ἡ κρίσις ἡ πρώτη), yet with a *sure* hope of ultimate deliverance (Rom. viii. 21—at the manifestation, *namely*, of the sons of God). The future judgment (ἡ κρίσις ἡ δευτέρα) of the great day, therefore, will be to all the redeemed, both of men and things, a day of joy and rejoicing,—a day of deliverance,—indeed, the day (ἡμέρα ἀπολυτρώσεως) of completed and perfect redemption from the power of Satan, sin, and the curse. But to all not effectually brought within the covenant of redemption, it will be a day of wrath no longer suspended (ἡμέρα ὀργῆς, Rom. ii. 5), in which the power of the primeval curse will be thenceforward and for ever felt with unmitigated severity, aggravated even by the guilt of rejected or neglected mercy;—a day of everlasting banishment and expulsion, together with Satan and all the effects of the curse, from the

redeemed earth, and the holy creation of God. This is the second death spoken of by John (ὁ δεύτερος θάνατος), Rev. xx. 14—that is, a repetition of that sentence of death originally pronounced against man at his fall (Gen. iii. 19; ii. 17), and of subjection to its power without hope of deliverance. Hence, the event denoted by the words ἵνα αὐτὴ ἡ ἐκβάλη εἰς οὐκὸς τῆς γῆς κρίσιν, is the completed redemption of the world; the outward manifestation of the sons of God (Rom. viii. 19) and their translation from suffering to glory.

One suggestion more: To comprehend this passage fully, we must carefully compare the Evangelist's interpretation of the prophet with the original text, and in doing so we may assume, that as both wrote by inspiration, their meaning is the same.

The word judgment (מִשְׁפָּט) occurs *thrice* in the prophet, but only *twice* in the Evangelist. The prophet says (v. 1), "he shall bring forth (וְצִיָּא) judgment to the Gentiles," which the Evangelist interprets (κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγεῖλαι) "he shall show (that is, announce) judgment to the Gentiles." Again: the prophet declares (v. 3), "he shall bring forth judgment" (same words) "unto truth" (לְאֱמֻנָה) which the Evangelist interprets (ἵνα αὐτὴ ἡ ἐκβάλη εἰς οὐκὸς τῆς γῆς κρίσιν) "until he cast out entirely and for ever the judgment," i. e. as explained, the effects of the curse. Finally; the prophet says, "he shall not fail nor be discouraged (וְעָזַב) till he have set (וְיָשָׁם) i. e. firmly established) judgment in the earth." This clause the Evangelist does not quote; but he transfers the Heb. particle (*till*) from it to the preceding clause, because that clause, as expressed by him with this particle in connexion, condenses the sense of both.

This will be apparent if we understand the word judgment as denoting one or the other of those great acts of the Divine government, already spoken of, to wit, either that which took place at the fall of man, when the kingdom of God was withdrawn and the reign of sin, Satan, and the curse began; or that which shall hereafter take place, by the effect of which the earth shall be purged from the pollution of sin and the kingdom of God be restored. (Matt. vi. 10.)

To announce judgment to the Gentiles in the first of these senses is to show them the origin and nature of sin, the con-

dition of mankind as sinners, and the wrath of God, as made manifest in the condition of the world ever since the apostasy. In this sense we understand John xvi. 8. To preach judgment in this sense and the means of escaping it, is nothing less than to preach the corruption of nature and redemption by Jesus Christ, which is the substance of revealed religion. When, therefore, the prophet adds, that the Redeemer "shall not fail nor be discouraged till he have set or firmly established judgment" (*i. e.* judgment in the sense secondly above explained) in the earth, he means that the Redeemer will carry on the work he has undertaken until he shall make it absolutely perfect and complete in the kingdom of God—*i. e.* until there shall be no more sin, nor sorrow, nor death, nor curse, but all things shall be made new, and brought under the headship of the second Adam. (See Rev. xxi. 4, 5, 6; xxii. 3.)

The idea of the other clause of the prophet—"he shall bring forth judgment *unto truth*"—is the same: For the truth intended by the prophet (as has been shown) is that true and abiding condition of things the Redeemer has undertaken to restore; which includes, necessarily, as a part of it, the expulsion of Satan and the curse. The idea of both clauses then being the same, both expressions are condensed by the Evangelist in the words under consideration, which he is able to do, by rendering the word אֲצִיִּי differently in the successive clauses of the prophet (παγγιλαῖ, ἰσβαλεῖ) according to the event predicted, retaining, however, the particle (עַיִן) in order to denote distinctly the limit or ultimate result of the Redeemer's work.

John xx. 17. Touch me not—μή μου ἅπτο—*for I have not yet ascended to my Father—ὕπα γὰρ αναβίβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου.*

Great liberties have been taken in the interpretation of this passage by commentators, both Romanist and Protestant. Yet the sense of the words is very obvious. The difficulty is to reconcile the reason of the prohibition—(for I have not yet ascended, &c.)—with the fact that the Lord, a short time after, allowed the women, returning from the sepulchre, to hold him by the feet (Matt. xxviii. 9). Yet he did not ascend, it is supposed, until forty days after his resurrection. In the meantime he not only allowed the dis-

ciples to touch him, but commanded them to do so. (Luke xxiv. 39. John xx. 25.)

This difficulty is usually got rid of by rejecting the literal sense, and substituting another which the words do not naturally bear. Thus: "Cling not to me—spend no more time with me in joyful gratulations. For I *am not going immediately to ascend*, &c. *Non statim ascendo—adhuc versor in terris*—You will have several opportunities of seeing me again. But go to my brethren and tell them (*αὐτοῖς*) that I *shall depart* to my Father and your Father, &c., &c.

This paraphrase converts the present and perfect tenses of *αὐτῶν* into the future, and assigns to *ἵπτομαι* a sense which elsewhere it does not bear. (See Matt. viii. 3, 15; ix. 20, 21, 29; xiv. 36; xvii. 7; xx. 34. Mark i. 41; iii. 10; v. 27, 28, 30, 31; vi. 56; vii. 33; viii. 22. Luke v. 13; vi. 19; vii. 14, 39; viii. 44, 45; 46, 47; xviii. 15; xxii. 51.) See also Canne, Brown, Blaney, Scott, Townsend, Chandler, Clark, Diodati, Jansenius, Bengel, Lamy, Chemnitz, Critici Sacri, &c.) However much the commentators differ in the sense they extract from the words, they very generally agree in rejecting the literal sense. The following suggestion proceeds upon the assumption that the literal sense, as rendered in the English version, gives the true reason of the prohibition, "Touch me not."

The High Priest of the Levitical economy was a type of Christ. He only, of all the priests, went into the holy place once a year, and then not without blood. (Levit. xvi. 3. Exod. xxx. 10. Heb. ix. 7, 12.) No person was to be with him in the tabernacle of the congregation on the great day of expiation. (Lev. xvi. 17.) Preparatory to the solemnities of that day, the High Priest was removed from his house and family seven days before, lest he should contract a defilement, which would incur a seven days' uncleanness, and so be disqualified for that solemn occasion. On the day of atonement he purified himself with water before he entered on his duties (Levit. xvi. 4), and one reason why no person was permitted to be with him in the tabernacle at that time was (it is probable), to prevent the possibility of ceremonial or actual pollution, even by the slightest touch of any of the people for whom he was officiating. Other

reasons are suggested by Scott, Henry, and Bush. See Grotius and Owen's works, vol. i. pp. 249-250.

Now, the whole of this ceremonial was typical of the sacrificial work of our Lord; and when he appeared to Mary, he was, so to speak, midway in the action of making that atonement, which the Levitical ceremony and the High Priest prefigured. He (the priest and the victim) had been slain; his blood poured; but he had not yet entered within the veil; that is, he had not yet entered into the upper sanctuary, of which the earthly was a type. He had not yet (using our Lord's own words) ascended to the Father. Hence the prohibition—"Touch me not." The type must be fulfilled in all points, and in this as well as in others.

Having thus exhibited himself to Mary, he gives her a message to his brethren, quite different from that he gave soon after to the women returning from the sepulchre. (Matt. xxviii. 10, 7; Mark xvi. 7.) "Go to my brethren and say to them, *I ascend* to my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." The Evangelist does not inform us how, or how soon, he disappeared from the view of Mary; but we have no warrant for supposing that he remained any time after he gave her this message. The only ground we have for any opinion upon this question is, his own word to Mary, "*I ascend*," *αναβαινω*—*statim ascendo*—"I am now on the point of ascending to my Father," or in the act of entering within the veil, to perfect (or complete) that atonement, which was prefigured by the action of the High Priest on the day of expiation." Having thus spoken to Mary (*αφῃσεν ἑαυτὴν ἀπ' αὐτῆς*, Luke xxiv. 31), he ceased to be seen by her.

Having ascended, he appeared soon afterwards (Mark xvi. 9), to the women returning from the sepulchre (Matt. xxviii. 9), and then again to Peter, and again to the two disciples going to Emmaus, and afterwards to the eleven on the evening of the same day. These appearances, it is suggested, were all from heaven, except the first to Mary, and so were all the other appearances during the forty days.

It is commonly taken for granted, that our Lord's *first* ascension was *visible*. Hence it is inferred, that he remained on earth forty days after his work of humiliation and suffering was finished, for the purpose of qualifying his disci-



ples to be eye-witnesses of the fact of his resurrection. Yet on the evening of the day of his resurrection, he spoke of himself to his disciples, as being no longer with them (Luke xxiv. 44). Locally he was with them at that time, but only as he was with Abraham in the plain of Mamre (Gen. xviii. 1). Why should his ascension be delayed, for the purpose of showing his risen body to his disciples? (Acts x. 40, 41; Luke xxiv. 39, 40, 42, 43; John xx. 25; Acts i. 3.) Why may we not believe that he appeared to them each time from heaven, as afterwards he did to Paul? Is there any text, which proves that his risen body was locally confined to the earth during all this time?

The reason why his last ascension was visible, is explained by the angels (Acts i. 11). It was to teach the disciples a great lesson imperfectly understood by them, in the most impressive manner (see John xvi. 17), as well as to apprise them that he would no more appear in their midst at unawares; but that his next visible appearance would be in fulfilment of his own prediction (Luke xxi. 27; see Dan. vii. 13), which would occur according to the manner of his ascension. Of this fact (viz. his ascension) they were to be *eye-witnesses*, and as such, to proclaim and attest it (Acts ii. 35). But to return to the passage under consideration:—

It is possible, that inadequate, and even low conceptions of the Saviour's power, have had some influence upon the common interpretation of this verse. Insensibly we are influenced by the idea of *difficulty* and *distance*, as though it would require *effort* and *lapse of time* even for the Saviour to ascend to or return from the throne of his Father. Such impressions, if they exist, are erroneous. We cannot, indeed, conceive *adequately* of the attributes with which our Lord has invested his glorified humanity. But we know that it is the tabernacle of his omnipotence—the most wonderful, the most perfect work of his Almighty power and infinite skill. It is neither unscriptural nor unreasonable to believe, that he who gave to light its velocity and to electricity its strength, would impart to his glorified humanity powers immeasurably greater, yea so great as to make it the fit instrument of his infinite purposes. To him, the universe of worlds is accessible at his will, and its remotest extremes but as the adjacent apartments of his Father's house (John

xiv. 2; Heb. iii. 4; John xvi. 28; iii. 13; Prov. xxx. 4). Who that believes the Scriptures can doubt that the Saviour can at his pleasure appear at any moment, in any part of the universe he governs?

This thought, no doubt, filled Paul's mind when he exhorted the Philippians to moderation by the consideration (Phil. iv. 5; ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς), "The Lord is near." He is near; because at the instant (sooner than we can think the thought), he can stand visibly at our side, or appear in the clouds of heaven, if such be his will. Why then may we not receive the words he addressed to Mary Magdalene in their obvious sense? To ascend to the Father—to enter within the veil—to enter the upper sanctuary, required of him not time, not effort, but only the will to do so. To pass from thence to the women returning from the sepulchre, was to him no more than to pass from the sepulchre to the place where he met them. Time, space, distance, all the entities and powers of nature are literally of no account to him, with whom to will is to do.

Yet glorious and powerful, beyond all comparison with created natures, as is the glorified humanity of our Lord, the apostles teach us, that it is the pattern to which he will conform the risen bodies of his elect (Philip. iii. 21; 1 John iii., 2). This (we may add) is that Divine nature to which the apostle Peter refers, whereof he says, the sons of God shall be partakers, when they shall be received into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (2 Pet. i. 4, 11; see Eph. i. 19-23; iii. 18-20; 1 Cor. ii. 9). Can any order of creatures be above those who shall wear the same body as the incarnate Saviour?

2 Pet. i. 20, 21. "Knowing this first"—bearing it always in mind as a first principle—"that no prophecy of the Scripture"—as to its principal intent—"is of any private interpretation," &c.

Were not these verses added for the purpose of excluding an inference, which an incautious reader might otherwise derive from the comparison the apostle makes in the preceding verse? "We have also a more sure,"—(that is, a more permanent or less transient proof of the Divine sonship of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of his heirship of the everlasting kingdom (v. 11) than was furnished by the trans-

figuration of which I have spoken (vs. 16, 17, 18), namely, the—"word of prophecy wherunto ye do well that ye take heed as unto a light"—rather lamp—"that shineth in a dark place," &c.

The apostle here likens the believer to a person groping in some dark, squalid (*αυχμηρῶ*) place,—a catacomb or subterraneous cavern it may be—holding in his hand a lighted lamp, by taking heed to which he may avoid the dangers and pollutions of the place. To such a means of safety and guidance, he compares prophecy, and it answers that end (see Luke xxi. 28–34). But, lest the reader should carry the comparison too far, and pervert or lose sight of the general intent and scope of the prophecies by confining them to such uses, the apostle adds the caution in the 20th and 21st verses; as if he had said, "But you must always bear it in mind, that no prophecy of the Scripture is to be regarded as primarily or principally designed for, or applicable to such a use. For prophecy, as to its chief intent, is to be compared rather to a heavenly luminary which shines for worlds, than to a lamp, which shines only for him who bears it. Prophecy belongs to a vast scheme, which God, its author, only can fully comprehend. Thus understood, the connexion of thought is apparent, and the verses under consideration, while they guard against a perversion of the figure, declare a truth of vast import for general instruction.

The meaning of *ιδίας ἐπιλύσεως* is suggested by the context thus explained:—Although prophecy *may be ιδίας ἀφίλειας* (like a lamp), it is not *ιδίας ἐπιλύσεως*: because it is pervaded by the mind of God; it partakes of the largeness of his designs, and like the sun, sheds its rays on worlds and systems of worlds far beyond our ken.

Matt. xx. 23. But to sit on my right hand and on my left—*οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι*—is not mine to give—*ἀλλ' οἷς ἠτοίμασται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου*—but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.

In the parable of the nobleman (Luke xix. 11–27), our Lord represents himself as the sovereign arbiter of the rewards of his kingdom; and many passages of Scripture may be cited to prove that all power, all judgment is committed unto him as the Son (John v. 22, 27; Matt. xxviii.

18; John xvii. 2; xiii. 3). Yet, in the administration of his kingdom he will, no doubt, act strictly in conformity with the Divine purposes. And this, it is suggested, is the only limitation intended by our Lord in his answer to the mother of James and John above quoted. Adopting this view, we should strike out the interpolated words, "it shall be given," and read thus:—"is not mine to give but (or except) *to them* for whom it has been prepared by my Father."

The Vulgate is, "Non meum est dare *vobis* sed quibus paratum est a patre meo." The version of Erasmus runs thus:—"Non meum est dare, sed *iis* *continget* quibus paratum est a patre meo." Montanus is more literal:—"Non est meum dare sed quibus paratum est a patre meo." The translation of Fabricius from the Syriac, is thus:—"Non meum est ut dem, nisi *iis*, quibus paratum est a patre meo,"—"is not mine to give except *to those* for whom it is prepared by my Father" (Murdock). Gilbert Wakefield gives the same sense. Diodati interpolates the words, "but *it shall be given*," &c. (*ma sarà dato a coloro*), which agrees with the authorized English version. But this seems contrary to Rev. iii. 21, and Matt. xix. 28, and the other passages above cited. The particle *ελλα* is sometimes used by the LXX. in the sense of *except* (Numb. xxxv. 33; Dan. ii. 11; see Mark iv. 22; 2 Cor. v. 4).

PHILO.

#### ART. III.—THE LAWS OF SYMBOLIZATION, AND THEIR RESULTS IN INTERPRETATION.

WE shall allege one or two other examples, in which commentators, while construing agents as standing for agents, still disregard the law of a general resemblance, and assume that some single point of likeness, real or imaginary, is the sole ground on which the symbol is used. The construction often put on the binding of Satan, Rev. xx. 1-3, is an example of it.

"And I saw an angel descending from heaven, having the key of the abyss, and a great chain in his hand. And he

seized the dragon, the old serpent, who is the devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the abyss, and shut and set a seal on him, that he should not deceive the nations any more, until the thousand years should be finished. And after them he must be loosed a short time."

There are writers who, though they interpret the agents in this passage as denoting agents, and hold that Satan represents himself, yet maintain that his binding and imprisonment are not prophetic of the absolute interception of his tempting influence on the nations, but only of its diminution and circumscription within narrow limits. Thus Mr. Faber says:—

"With respect to that binding of Satan which immediately precedes the Millennium, it must plainly be considered as a transaction not visible to human eyes.

"The power of the evil spirit being effectually restrained through the well-nigh universal prevalence of genuine religion, perhaps also his seductive influence being specially coerced by the direct though unseen interference of the Almighty, he is *said*, by an easy and natural *image*, to be chained fast in the *poetical* and central prison of the great oceanic abyss; an abode, the notion of which is familiar alike to the pagan bards and the inspired writers."—*Calendar of Prophecy*, vol. iii. p. 332.

He thus treats Satan as the agent who is to be the subject of the acts denoted by his binding and imprisonment; and exhibits the angel who binds and imprisons him, as symbolizing either the influence of religion, or "the interference" of the Almighty, in which they are contemplated as agents; while the import he ascribes to the binding and imprisonment falls wholly below its real meaning. His construction, indeed, except that he exhibits Satan as the subject of the binding and incarceration, is mistaken, and inconsistent in the extreme with the laws of symbolization. What can be more inapt or absurd, than to represent "the well nigh universal prevalence of genuine religion," as the *cause* of the diminution of Satan's tempting influence? It is like assigning the universal prevalence of good crops, as the *cause*, that there are no droughts, mildews, blights, frosts, destructive tempests, or mischievous insects; or alleging the universal

prevalence of health as the reason that there are no pestilences nor deaths. Why is it that there are no fatal epidemics? Why is it that neither drought, frost, insects, nor any of the other numerous causes that prevent the growth of crops, are in activity? The reason of the non-existence of those antagonistic forces lies back of the health and crops, of which that non-existence is a condition. In like manner, why is it that there is to be a "well nigh universal prevalence of genuine religion?" Is not one of the reasons to be, that Satan is to be withheld by incarceration from preventing it by his deceptive influences? The conversion of the nations is to be *consequential* on his being bound, and intercepted from tempting them; not his being bound and imprisoned, consequential on their conversion. If otherwise, how is it that the renewed revolt of the nations, after the thousand years, is to be consequential on his being released from the abyss, and going forth again to deceive them?

He is in an equal error in interpreting the angel who "seizes and binds Satan," as representing the Almighty exerting an "unseen influence." Such a creature has no adaptation to represent the Almighty by whose command he acted; nor has his really and visibly seizing, binding, and casting Satan into an abyss, any adaptation to symbolize an invisible influence on him. It is inconsistent also with the principle on which Mr. Faber interprets Satan as the symbol of himself. If Satan represents himself in being bound and cast into an abyss, why should not the angel who binds him and hurls him into the abyss, be taken as representing himself in those acts?

Mr. Faber's representation that Satan is merely "*said* by an easy and natural image to be chained fast in the *poetical* and central prison of the great oceanic abyss," is another instance of the inconsiderate manner in which he sets aside the symbols of the prophecy, when they stand in the way of his constructions. There is no metaphorical expression in the passage. There is no mere poetical or imaginary abyss mentioned in it. The prophet says, he *saw* the angel descending from heaven, having the key of the abyss, and a chain in his hand; and he seized the dragon, who is the devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the abyss, and shut and set a seal on him, that he should not deceive the nations any more, till released at the

end of the thousand years. The binding, accordingly, the abyss, the casting of Satan into it, and the shutting the entrance and sealing it, were as visible to the prophet, and as absolutely real, as the angel descending from heaven, the key, the chain, and Satan himself were. To assert, therefore, that Satan was merely *said* to be bound with a chain in a *poetical* prison, is in effect to deny that the chain, the binding, the abyss, and the casting into it, and shutting and sealing its gate, were *seen* in the vision; and thence, to turn them from symbols into mere fancies, and divest them of their prophetic office.

As Mr. Faber thus grossly misconceives the nature of several of the symbols of the vision, so he misrepresents that which their actions denote. To maintain that the absolute interception of Satan from access to the nations by imprisonment in the abyss, from which they are excluded, only signifies that, though he still has as free access to the scene which they occupy as he before had, he still is only able to exert on them a diminished influence, is to offer the grossest violation to the symbol. It were scarcely a more flagrant contradiction to it, to assert, that it signifies no diminution or restraint whatever of his tempting agency. Mr. Faber might as well pretend that the resurrection of the holy dead, vs. 4-6, and of the unholy, vs. 12-15, denotes only a partial resurrection,—a mere diminution of the power of death over its victims; or that the justification of the righteous, and condemnation of the wicked, are but partial, and leave the one in a measure under the dominion of the curse, and the other free in a degree from its execution. As the symbolic binding and confinement in the abyss were a total interception of Satan from tempting the nations, so his exclusion from their presence, and confinement to another scene, which that binding and punishment represent, must constitute a total prevention of him from exerting on them a tempting agency during the period of that binding and banishment.

Mr. Faber's construction is thus manifestly mistaken. There is nothing whatever in the vision that yields it a color of truth; it is at every point a weak and absurd contradiction of it. And it is a mistake of great moment, casting a dark shadow over the future, and blotting from faith and hope the most precious and glorious features of the great

purposes of mercy which God has revealed towards the world. For if there is no prediction here that Satan is to be banished from the earth during the thousand years, and prevented from tempting the nations; if there is nothing more than a prophecy that he is to be put under a measure of restraint, and is to be less successful in his plots against Christ's kingdom, we can have no certainty or probability of a millennium of righteousness and peace; or that an age is ever to come in which the nations will be essentially better than they now are. For whatever reason can render it incumbent to restrict the meaning of this prophecy within the narrow limits which Mr. F. assigns to it, must make it equally necessary to reduce all the other predictions and promises of a better age to the same dimensions. The great announcements accordingly that all nations shall come and worship before God; that the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of him, and that he shall dwell with men, and that the curse of sorrow, toil, suffering, and death shall be removed, sink into mere predictions that a large portion of the nations will worship him, that they will have a greater knowledge of him, and that there will be less suffering, sorrow, and death! But not only is all prospect of the redemption of the world thus extinguished, but all certainty also of any essential improvement; for who, on the grounds on which Mr. Faber proceeds, is to fix the limit within which the tempting agency of Satan is to be restrained! If his being chained and shut within the abyss, so that he has no access to the nations, signifies only that he is to be less at large, less active and successful in his malignant agency than before; who can tell to what degree his activity and influence are to be lessened? There can be no means of knowing that the diminution is to be more than the most slight in degree and duration. The whole significance of the prophecy is smitten out of it by his construction, and it sinks into an empty and deceptive shadow. The prediction also, v. 10, that soon after the close of the thousand years, Satan is to be finally and for ever banished from the earth and confined in the world of punishment, is emptied in like manner of all its meaning, and we are left without any assurance that the race is not for ever to continue under his malignant agency. For if his being seized, bound, and



shut up in the abyss, so that he cannot deceive the nations, does not foreshow that he is to be debarred from access to them and the continued and successful exercise on them of his tempting influence, how can his being cast into the lake of fire and brimstone to be tormented for ever, make it certain that he is not still to roam the earth through the endless years of his torment, tempt its population, and lead them to revolt? Mr. Faber's arbitrary interpretation would thus blot from the sacred page every assurance of a better age, and consign the race, through the endless series of its generations, to the thrall of Satan and of death.

Why now was it that against the clearest significance of the symbols, and without a solitary reason to justify it, Mr. Faber put on the prophecy this fatal misconstruction? Undoubtedly, because he regards symbolization as founded on nothing more than a slight resemblance in a single particular, between the representative and that which it represents, and was unaware that there must subsist between them a general correspondence of office, condition, agency, and effects; and thence, as there is a resemblance between absolutely precluding Satan from tempting the nations, and partially preventing him from it, he maintained that the latter is all that his symbolic binding and imprisonment can be considered as foreshowing.

It is on the same ground that the first resurrection, v. 4-8, is interpreted by anti-millenarian writers generally as symbolizing a mere conversion of living men.

"And I saw thrones; and they sat on them; and judgment was given unto them; and *I saw* the souls of those who had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and whoever had not worshipped the wild beast, nor its image, and had not received the mark on their forehead, and on their hand. And they lived and reigned with Christ the thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years should be finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he who has part in the first resurrection. Over them the second death has no power; but they shall be priests of God and Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years. And when the thousand years shall be finished, Satan shall be loosed from his prison, and shall go forth to seduce the nations which

are in the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them to battle, the number of whom is as the sand of the sea."

Mr. Faber, while assuming that the symbolic persons in this vision are representative of persons, yet maintains that the resurrections that are foreshown, are not literal like the symbols, but merely figurative or moral. Thus, after asserting that there is no Scriptural ground for expecting the literal second advent of Christ at the commencement of the millennium, he affirms, that in this passage—

"We are first taught that those who were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years; and we are next taught in immediate consecution, that the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished: whence of course it follows, that so soon as the thousand years are finished, the rest of the dead do live again.

"These two particulars being thus uninterruptedly set forth in one and the same passage, and being thus evidently foretold in direct mutual relation, must, according to the rules of good composition, be interpreted *homogeneously*; that is to say, of whatever nature the *one* resurrection is, whether *literal* or *figurative*, of that same nature must also be the *other* resurrection.

"Now, the resurrection of the rest of the dead takes place, we are told, at the end of the thousand years. But the end of the thousand years is not the end of the world. On the contrary, the thousand years are followed in regular succession, first, by the liberation of Satan; next, by his going out to deceive the nations which are then existing in the four quarters of the earth; next, by the formation of the confederacy of Gog and Magog, out of those thus deceived nations; next, by the going up of the confederacy to compass the holy city: next, by the miraculous destruction of that confederacy through fire from heaven; and then at length, after the lapse of some undefined period subsequent to the destruction of the confederacy by the ultimate universal judgment of the resuscitated dead, both small and great, at the literal second advent of Christ, and at the final consummation of all things. Therefore, what is called *the resurrection of the rest of the dead*, occurring as it does only at the end of the thousand years, and long before the final consummation of all things, cannot be the *literal* resurrection of the dead, both small and great, both from the sea and from Hades. . . But if it cannot be the literal resurrection at the literal day of universal judgment, it must be a *figurative* resurrection before the literal day of universal

judgment. Otherwise, what is a palpable contradiction, we shall make two *general* and *literal* resurrections: the *one* general resurrection at the end of the thousand years; the *other* general resurrection at some undefined epoch subsequent to the destruction of Gog and Magog.

"The resurrection, then, of the rest of the dead, at the end of the thousand years, has been shown, by the very necessity of its collocation, to be *figurative*. But homogeneity requires that the two resurrections, the one at the end, the other at the beginning of the thousand years, should be similarly understood and interpreted. Therefore, the resurrection of the martyrs, at the beginning of the thousand years, must be a purely *figurative* resurrection also."—*Sacred Calendar*, vol. iii., pp. 333–334.

He thus regards the subjects of these resurrections as human persons; and yet interprets the events denoted by the resurrections themselves, as bearing to them no general analogy, but only a faint resemblance in a single relation. The utter error, however, of his construction, is apparent from many considerations.

In the first place, he does not profess to found it on *the nature of the symbols*; but on the fact, first, that the two resurrections are revealed in *the same passage*, which has nothing to do with the question what it is that they represent; and next, on the arbitrary and false assumption that the revolt of Gog and Magog, which Satan prompts after his release, is the event denoted by the resurrection of the rest of the dead; on the ground that it took place immediately on the close of the thousand years. The meaning which he assigns to the resurrections, thus, is not founded at all on their nature as symbols, but is the work of his false and preposterous logic. This is his usual method, indeed, of determining the import of the visions, and it leads him into the most palpable and fatal errors.

In the second place: If, as he alleges, the fact that a space of some length, we know not how great, perhaps thirty, forty, or fifty years—is to intervene between the end of the thousand years and the resurrection of the dead from the grave and the sea, is a proof that that is not the resurrection of the rest of the dead foretold v. 5; then the fact that a space is to intervene between the end of the thousand years and the revolt of the nations, is an equal proof that

that revolt cannot, as Mr. F. maintains, be the event denoted by the resurrection of the rest of the dead. For a period is as clearly to intervene between Satan's release and going forth to seduce the nations, and the time of their actually uniting in a formal revolt. It is to contradict the nature of men to suppose that Satan can, in the first moment or hour or day of his release, address his tempting agency to a large body of nations, and seduce them instantaneously to rebellion. Who are the parties who are thus to apostatize? They cannot be persons who have been renewed, and lived obediently down to the moment of Satan's assailing them with his tempting influences. That were contradictory to the great law of God's administration, that all whom he renews and sanctifies, he justifies and saves. But how can they grow up to maturity unsanctified, unless they are born after the close of the thousand years, when the Spirit of God will no longer renew all who come into life, as in the millennial age, but leave the hosts, at least, of Gog and Magog, to grow up under Satan's baleful influence in impenitence, and at length unite in war on the camp of the saints? But that would require a space of thirty or forty years, and separate the revolt very nearly as far, there is reason to believe, from the termination of the thousand years, as the resurrection of the dead from the grave and the sea is to be.

In the third place: But his construction is contradictory, in the utmost degree, to the symbols, and cannot be maintained on any ground. The revolt of Gog and Magog, and their going up on the face of earth and encompassing the camp of the saints and the beloved city, are symbolic acts; and must, therefore, either represent acts like themselves, or else acts of a different but analogous nature. But if they symbolize acts like themselves, then plainly they do not symbolize a resurrection, either figurative or literal. If, on the other hand, they represent acts differing from themselves, but of a resembling nature, then it is equally clear that they cannot represent a resurrection either literal or figurative. What analogy is there between a revolt of nations from a government, and assembling and marching to capture a city, and a resurrection of a host of dead persons from the grave? Does the union of England and

.

France in a war against Russia, and their sending armies to besiege and take Sebastopol, present any resemblance to the resurrection of a vast train of persons from death to life? Could any one, not wholly without a knowledge of the laws of analogy, persuade himself that the one can be a fit symbol of the other?

In the fourth place: If, as he maintains, three resurrections are foretold in the chapter, and his notion of homogeneity is valid, that their being predicted in near connexion with each other, renders it necessary to interpret them as denoting events of the same kind; then, if his constructions of the first, and of what he calls the second, are correct, it follows that the third predicted vs. 9-15, is also to be a mere figurative resurrection—that is, a revolt from God; as is seen from the fact, that the subjects of it are to be unholy, and are to be judged and cast into the lake of fire. Its being predicted in immediate connexion with the revolt of Gog and Magog, is as ample proof that it is to be interpreted on the principle of homogeneity—as a figurative resurrection; as the close connexion of the prediction of the first and second resurrection is, that they are to be interpreted on that principle. But what then is the import of their judgment and precipitation into the lake of fire? Is any such figurative arraignment at the tribunal of Christ, sentence to the second death, and dejection into hell, revealed in the Bible? Could Mr. Faber, were he still among the living, give a satisfactory account of their nature? But he here deserts his law of homogeneity, and interprets this resurrection as a literal resurrection of dead persons from the grave and sea. Consistency, therefore, required that he should interpret the first, also, as a literal resurrection of the righteous. For they were seen living by the prophet, as truly as those were who were raised from the grave and sea in the second resurrection. They were judged, also, and rewarded in his presence, as truly as those of the second resurrection; for judgment, or judicial authority, was given to them—they were seated on thrones—and they reigned with Christ during the thousand years: rewards as conspicuous and glorious, as the sentence inflicted on the wicked of the second resurrection was dreadful. Not a reason can be given for regarding the last as a

literal resurrection, that is not an equally effective proof that the former is also of that character.

In the fifth place: But the total error of his construction is seen from the fact, that a resurrection of persons from the dead cannot possibly symbolize what he calls a figurative resurrection, as no analogy subsists between them. He says:—

“As the very construction of the prophecy itself will conduct us to the sense in which the *second* resurrection ought to be understood, we will begin our inquiry with that second resurrection; for when its import shall have been ascertained, we shall then, on the principle of homogeneity, have no difficulty in ascertaining likewise the import of the *first* resurrection.

“At the close of the thousand years, the rest of the dead, or those dead who are contradistinguished from the faithful martyrs of Christ, rise again; and at the self-same epoch, Satan is loosed, and goes out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth. The result of his machinations is the formation of an antichristian confederacy, which may well be deemed the *revival* or the *re-appearance* of the antichristian confederacy previously destroyed at the close of the latter 1260 years. This *revival* or *figurative resurrection* of the antichristian confederacy, occurring as it does synchronically with the resurrection of *the rest of the dead*, who are contradistinguished from the faithful martyrs of Christ, must, I think, be no other than *that identical resurrection*. The rest of the dead, or those men of antichristian principles, who hated and persecuted the faithful, and who are therefore contradistinguished from them, are *figuratively* restored to life, in the person of those who are deceived by Satan, at the close of the thousand years, who embrace anew the principles of antichristianism, and who at length are moulded into a second great confederacy against the remnant of the sincere church of God.

“Such is the interpretation which both chronology and circumstantiality require us to give of the resurrection of those other dead persons who are contradistinguished from the martyrs of Christ. As a collective or corporate body, they were slain in the fight of Armageddon, at the close of the latter 1260 years, when the antichristian confederacy of the Roman king was destroyed; as a collective or corporate body, they rise again from the dead at the close of the thousand years, when the antichristian confederacy of the Roman king is *figuratively* revived in the antichristian confederacy of Gog and Magog.

"From the now ascertained sense of the second resurrection, we shall have no difficulty in ascertaining the sense of the first resurrection.

"Homogeneity, as we have already seen, demands that the resurrection of the martyrs, at the commencement of the thousand years, should be interpreted analogically to the resurrection of their enemies at the end of the thousand years. But the resurrection of their enemies denotes the reappearance of men, influenced by the same antichristian spirit as that which characterized their enemies. Therefore, the resurrection of the martyrs will homogeneously denote the reappearance of men animated by the temper and principles of the martyrs."—*Sacred Calendar*, vol. iii., pp. 335, 336.

The whole range of lawless interpretation presents few specimens, we think, that transcend this in error and presumption. He does not even affect to found his construction on the symbols themselves; he treats them as of no significance; but builds it openly and wholly on what he calls "chronology and circumstantiality," by which are meant his unauthorized and absurd assumptions. His interpretation, however, will not hold; as there is no analogy between a resurrection of dead persons to a new corporeal life, and the birth and growth of a generation of persons who resemble such as have before lived in the world. To call the rise of such persons a *figurative* resurrection, is the grossest abuse of language. The Presbyterians of Scotland of the present day, for example, are in many respects what their ancestors of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries were. But would any writer of sense deem himself justified in calling their coming into life, a *figurative* resurrection of their ancestors? Is the existence at this time in England of a body of Dissenters much like those of a century and a half ago, a *figurative* resurrection of those ancestral Dissenters? The Episcopalians of this age in many particulars resemble those of the times of James I., Queen Anne, William III., and George I. Are they, therefore, the Episcopalians of those ages by a *figurative* resurrection? The present generation of New Englanders are, in many of their characteristics, what their forefathers of the seventeenth century were. Can they, therefore, with propriety be said to be those forefathers *figuratively* raised from their graves! The bald incongruity, the senseless extravagance, the falsehood of the pretence are too apparent

to need exposure. It might as well be held that the animals and vegetables of the present day are those of their several classes that preceded them, by a figurative resurrection. A beautiful exemplification truly of Mr. Faber's method of interpretation by "chronology and circumstantiality." A man who should talk in that style on other subjects, would be considered a candidate for a lunatic asylum rather than for the office of a religious teacher. Mr. Faber was so completely carried away by his false theory of interpretation, that he had no disposition, it would seem, to look at the absurdities into which it betrayed him. The slightest consideration, the least knowledge either of symbols or figurative language, would have rendered him incapable of so gross a misrepresentation of the prophecy.

1. A *figurative* resurrection is simply an event that is called a resurrection by a *metaphor*, but that is not in fact one, but only resembles it in some relation. The fancy, therefore, that such a resurrection is predicted by a *symbol*, is an absurdity. It cannot be a *figurative* resurrection except by being called a resurrection by a *figure*. The mere fact that an event foreshown by the symbol resembles in some respect a resurrection from the dead, does not constitute it a *figurative* resurrection. It cannot acquire that character by any other means than by being pronounced a resurrection by a metaphor. The fancy that a figurative resurrection is foreshown by a symbol, is a sheer blunder, betraying the most unfortunate misapprehension of the nature both of symbols and figures.

2. On the supposition that the resurrections foreshown v. 4-6, were figurative resurrections, then by the laws of the metaphor, the identical persons who are there said to be raised, would be the persons who are to be the subjects of the figurative resurrections. For by the law of the metaphor, the persons of whom a metaphorical affirmation is made, are the persons who are to be the subjects or agents of the event which the metaphor denotes. But the persons who are here said to have risen, or whose future resurrection is foretold, are the literally dead;—the martyrs and true worshippers at the beginning of the thousand years; and the rest of the dead at the close of that period. No resurrection is affirmed or foreshown of any



others. Mr. Faber's construction thus again confutes itself. New generations of human beings coming into existence, as he supposes, long after the death of the persons whose resurrection is directly declared in the passage, cannot possibly be the persons who are to be the subjects of that resurrection. The dream that a figurative resurrection is foreshown in the passage, must therefore be dismissed.

3. It is equally contradictory to the laws of symbols, to imagine that a literal resurrection like those described v. 4 and 5, can represent an event—the rise of a body of men in the natural life—like that which Mr. F. calls a figurative resurrection. The events, instead of resembling, are in the utmost degree unlike each other. The persons whose literal resurrection is exhibited and foretold in the passage, were, previously to their resurrection, to have a literal corporeal life which they were to lose by a literal death. In order to an analogy between them and the persons who are to be the subjects of the resurrection of which theirs is the symbol, those persons must also have previously had a literal bodily life, and lost it by a literal death. But the human beings who, Mr. F. holds, are to be the subjects of the predicted resurrection, are not to have had a previous life in the body. The life which he calls a figurative resurrection is their first and only corporeal life here, and is no more a resurrection of themselves than a birth and life of any other persons are a resurrection of those persons. It is to confound and abuse language, and make a mockery of truth, to use terms in such a false and contradictory sense.

4. It is equally false to imagine that the natural birth and life of men in the world, is a resurrection of the dead of a former generation. As, by the supposition, those dead persons are still to remain under the power of death, and have no connexion whatever with the living on the earth; how can the life of a body of men on earth be *their* resurrection from death to that life? Can a greater solecism be conceived? Could any but an interpreter by "chronology and circumstantiality" be capable of adopting such a notion?

5. The resurrection of the righteous and the wicked foreshown in the vision, is to be in order to a judgment and rewards on account of their conduct in a previous corporeal life in the world. The entrance of the persons on a natural

life here, who Mr. F. supposes are to be the subjects of the resurrection, is to be in order to their being put on probation, that they may act a part for which they may be judged and rewarded at a subsequent period. In this respect, therefore, instead of an analogy, they present the utmost contrast to each other. The ends for which they are called into their respective lives are so totally unlike, as to make it impossible that the one should be the symbol of the other. Mr. Faber's interpretation is thus, in every relation, wholly untenable: a wild and senseless outrage, instead of an exposition of the vision.

The representative resurrection admits of but one construction by the laws of symbols, and that is given in the prophecy itself by the Spirit of inspiration, in the announcement, "This" resurrection in vision, is the symbol of "the first resurrection." As the persons whom the prophet saw raised and seated on thrones were persons who had died, those whom they represent must, by the laws of resemblance, be persons who have died; not persons in the natural life, to whom they present in that respect no likeness. As the resurrection exhibited in the vision was a literal resurrection from death, so that which it represents must be a literal resurrection to a corporeal life. No other event answers at all to the symbol. As those who were raised and seated on thrones, rose to be judged for the deeds of a previous corporeal life, and receive the reward of their actions, so those whom they represent must be raised to be judged and rewarded for the actions of a previous life. And finally, as those who were raised in the vision were holy, so those whose resurrection theirs symbolizes are the holy. It is accordingly expressly declared by the revealing Spirit, that the spectacle which the prophet saw, was the symbol of the first resurrection; and that those who were thus to be raised, were the blessed and holy, over whom the second death has no power, but who are to be kings and priests of God and of Christ, and to reign with him a thousand years. And no other events bear the requisite correspondence to the symbols. Dead persons cannot represent living ones. A rising of dead persons to a corporeal life cannot symbolize a mere change in the views, feelings, or acts of persons living a natural corporeal life. A rising from death to a judgment cannot represent the entrance on a course of action in the

natural life that is to be *the ground* of a judgment at a future time. They are the widest possible opposites. An investiture with kingly authority, session on thrones, and reigning with Christ the thousand prophetic years, or three hundred and sixty thousand literal years, cannot represent a natural life of thirty, forty, fifty, or perhaps a hundred years in the body, without kingly authority, without reigning with Christ, that is to be followed by death, and a slumber in the grave through a long series of ages. It is an unpardonable violence to the symbol to assign to it such a contradictory and senseless meaning.

And this is virtually conceded by Mr. Faber himself, in his construction of the second resurrection foretold v. 11-15—which he interprets as symbolizing a literal resurrection of dead persons to a judgment, and final rewards for the acts of their previous life in the body. There are no more indications that that is the symbol of a literal resurrection, than there are that the other is. The persons beheld by the prophet were no more the literally dead in the one vision, than they were in the other. The resurrection of the one was no more a real resurrection, and visible to the apostle, than the other was. The one no more rose to be judged and receive everlasting rewards for their conduct in their natural life in the body, than the other. Every consideration that makes it certain that the one is the symbol of a literal resurrection, makes it equally certain that the other is also.

Such, then, being the clear and indubitable import of the symbol, which is explained by the Spirit as representing the first resurrection, how is it that Mr. Faber, in place of giving it that meaning, assigned to it the false and preposterous office of representing what he calls a *figurative* resurrection, which is no resurrection whatever, and bears no analogy to one? The reason was, that he held that if that which is represented resembles, in a single particular, that which represents it, it is all that the laws of symbolization require. He accordingly presents the resemblance of the character he ascribes to those who he holds were symbolized, to the persons in the vision by whom they were represented, as comprising all that is needed to show that they are the persons whose resurrections the vision foreshows.

Thus he says :

"Homogeneity demands that the resurrection of the martyrs should be interpreted analogically to the resurrection of their enemies. But the resurrection of their enemies denotes the reappearance of men *influenced by the same antichristian spirit as that which characterized their enemies.* Therefore the resurrection of the martyrs will homogeneously denote the reappearance of men *animated by the temper and principles of the martyrs.*"

In assigning that single likeness of the two classes to their representatives, he thus thought reascribed to them all that the laws of symbolization require; and thence assumed that the enormous contradictions and absurdities of his constructions in other respects were no obstacle to their accuracy.

We might add many other examples of the same kind, but these are sufficient to show that a leading reason of the errors into which interpreters run, is an assumption that a single and slight resemblance of the thing represented to that which represents it, is all that symbolization implies; and to prove that no true interpretation of the symbolic prophecies can be made, except by the laws as we have stated them, of a general resemblance between the representative agents, acts, conditions, and effects, and the agents, actions, and events that are represented by them.

---

#### ART. IV.—THE PARABLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

##### VI. THE TREASURE.

Matthew xiii. 44.

"AGAIN, the kingdom of heaven is like to a treasure hid in a field, which when a man finds, he hides, and for joy of it, goes and sells all that he has, and buys that field."

The parable of the mustard seed was designed to show that the kingdom of heaven—notwithstanding its smallness at its institution, was at length to rise to a great size: and the parable of the leaven, that it is ultimately to bring the whole race under its power. The object of this and the next, is to show what the estimate is in which it is held by

those who discover its true character, and desire to belong to it. The parallel which this parable of the treasure presents to the kingdom of heaven, is in the suddenness and unexpectedness of the discovery of it, the delight and love it inspires, and the measures that are taken to possess it.

1. The treasure was hidden in the field. The man who found it had no knowledge or suspicion of its existence there. Its discovery was unexpected, and filled him with surprise and exhilaration.

So the kingdom of God is hidden from the eyes of men in their natural state. They are not aware of its existence in the world, nor of its true character. Like a man who looks on a field in which a treasure is hid, as containing nothing of worth but what appears on the surface; and as capable only of yielding under tillage, an annual growth of grass, grain, or other crops: so men, while unrenewed, look at the Christian world as nothing more than a modification of society that has sprung, like many other religious communities, from peculiar natural causes; and as involving nothing of a truly divine character. They have no apprehension that such a kingdom as that of God exists there, though veiled like a hidden treasure from the common eye. They have no suspicion that there is anything more there than what they see, of beliefs, affections, professions, and ritual and public acts, in which they themselves take a share. When, accordingly, the kingdom of God is discovered, it takes place suddenly. It bursts upon the eye like a hidden treasure, like a new-found world, like a dazzling vision from heaven, and has a nature, a beauty, a preciousness, a grandeur of which they had before no conception. The revelation is made by the Spirit of God, and is made in an instant, and fills the mind to which it is unveiled, with a wonder, joy, and rapture, as much higher than the surprise and gladness which the discovery of a hidden treasure gives, as the riches and glory of that inheritance that fadeth not away, transcend in greatness and worth the perishable baubles of earth.

2. The man who found the treasure, hid it, in order to make it his own. His object was to secure its possession to himself. Not to have taken the requisite measures to make

it his own would have been to treat it as of no value. To have proclaimed its discovery would have been to make it certain that his finding it was not to prove of any service to himself.

So he to whom the kingdom of God is revealed by the renewing Spirit, is instantly touched with a deep desire to enter and belong to it, and prompted to the requisite measures, that he may be one of its children, and share in its holy and immortal privileges and joys. His whole soul is drawn to it and to its King; and breathes itself out in wonder, adoration, joy, and praise. The glory of Christ, its monarch, attracts and dazzles it, his love swells and entrances it, and it longs to bask for ever in the light of his smile.

3. The man who found the treasure was impressed with such a sense of its value, and kindled with such joy at the thought of possessing it, that he sold all he had and purchased the field. However highly he may have prized some of his possessions; however delightful and cherished many of his associations with them may have been, he cheerfully and joyfully parted with them all, that he might gain the field by which he was to become the possessor of the new found treasure.

So they to whom the Spirit reveals the kingdom of God, instantly resign all the objects to which they had before given their chief love, the sacrifice of which is requisite to their becoming the children of the kingdom. And they are many and great: self, self-righteousness, sinful pleasures, pride, ambition, the love of the world; all the forms and all the objects of desire which the law of God forbids; are to be cheerfully and joyfully given up and abandoned for the sake of a place among Christ's followers. The continuance in what is sinful is as incompatible with admission to the new found kingdom, as the retention of all his former possessions by the man who discovered the treasure was with his becoming the owner of the field in which it lay buried. The new object can, in either case, be obtained only by the relinquishment of that which was before the chief treasure of the heart.

The lessons taught by the parable, thus are:

First: That the unrenewed have no discernment of the

kingdom of God. Its nature, and its existence, are hid from their view, like a treasure buried beneath the soil, over which the passenger may pass a thousand times, without discovering or suspecting that such a hoard lies beneath his feet.

Next: when discovered, it is discovered instantly, and fills the heart with wonder and joy. The Spirit, with one flash of dazzling light, pierces the blinding veil in which the soul is enveloped, and darting the rays of his truth through all its depths, reveals to its astonished gaze the Saviour who died for it, and the kingdom to which he invites it as an heir.

Thirdly: They to whom the kingdom of God is thus revealed, cheerfully give up all, the relinquishment of which is necessary to their becoming inheritors of the kingdom. To obtain admission to it is their highest desire. None but its joys can please their new affections, none others can satisfy their immortal wants. They have lost their taste for other enjoyments. Sin has become the object of aversion and dread.

Fourthly: They who have no consciousness of this high estimate of the kingdom of God, can have no evidence that they have a true knowledge of it, and are its children. They present no counterpart to the picture which the Saviour here draws of those who are truly the subjects of his renewing power.

#### VII. THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE.

Matthew xiii. 45, 46.

"Again the kingdom of heaven is like a merchant, seeking beautiful pearls, who when he had found one pearl of great value, went and sold all that he possessed, and bought it."

This parable exemplifies the estimate which a still different class of those who obtain a place in the kingdom of God, put on it. The man in the preceding parable finding a hid treasure, represents those to whom the kingdom of heaven is revealed by the renewing Spirit unexpectedly. But here the merchant seeking beautiful pearls, and finding one of great value, represents those who are seeking for that spiritual blessing which the pearl denotes, and find it

in the kingdom of heaven, in which the King is a Redeemer, who makes the necessary expiation for sin, and freely bestows the renovation and justification that are needed; and who receives those whom he renews and justifies into his kingdom to be heirs and joint-heirs with him in the beauties and blessedness of a holy and immortal life. For as the pearl of great value represents that which is obtained by admission to the kingdom, it must denote the acceptance with God, and the heirship with Christ, to which they are exalted who become children of the kingdom. The beautiful pearls, sought by the merchant, in distinction from that which is of great value, are other methods of justification with God and eternal life. Of these, one often sought by those who ultimately find the true method, is by their own righteousness; another is by ritual observances; a third is by reliance on the mercy of God irrespective of Christ. All those who seek acceptance on these and other similar grounds, when brought to a knowledge of the kingdom of heaven, which consists of human beings redeemed from sin and death, and crowned with immortal life and glory with Christ their Redeemer at their head, instantly see it to be just such a method of redemption as they need, and the only one that meets their wants, and relinquishing all other reliances for salvation, embrace it with all their hearts.

The lessons taught by the parable thus are:—

1. That all who embrace the method of acceptance with God revealed in the gospel, and become children of his kingdom, renounce all other modes of redemption, and all other grounds of reliance, and feel that to be washed in the blood of Christ, to be justified by his righteousness, and to be admitted to the station of kings and priests in his eternal kingdom, comprise a salvation the most suited to their wants, and the most worthy of the grandeur of the divine wisdom and love, that they can conceive.

2. On their discovering this kingdom, they give up all the objects of desire, the relinquishment of which is a condition of their becoming its children; as the merchant, on finding the pearl of great value, sold all that he possessed in order that he might purchase that. All other objects sink instantly to the heart, into the nothingness which belongs to them, compared to the infinite beauty and grandeur of a



place in the kingdom of the sanctified over whom Christ is to reign for ever and ever.

#### VIII. THE FISHING NET.

Matthew xiii. 47-50.

"Again: The kingdom of heaven is like a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind; which when it was filled, they drew to the shore, and sat down and gathered the good into vessels, but the bad they cast away. So shall it be at the end of the age: the angels shall come forth and separate the evil from among the just, and cast them into the furnace of fire. There shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth."

The preceding parables were designed to exemplify the reception which the kingdom of God was to meet from men, and the characteristics of those who become its children. The object of this is to show the separation from the righteous of those who reject it, that is at length to be made, and their subjection to punishment.

The kingdom of heaven which is compared to the net, is not, as some have imagined, the gospel; but the company of the renewed who believe in Christ, and in obedience to him as their King, preach the gospel, and perform the various duties which are appropriate to them as children of God. The gospel, instead of being the kingdom itself, is the good tidings of the kingdom. Those who are drawn professedly to join the children of the kingdom, and place themselves under its king and laws, are those who are represented by the fish. The parallel to the kingdom of God which needs to be illustrated, is that presented by the net, the fish that are caught, and the disposition that is made of them.

1. It was the net, and its being drawn through waters in which fish of all kinds abounded, that was the reason that fish of every kind were caught; not the skill or purpose of fishermen. It was not in their power to prevent bad from being intermixed with the good. They could not in any degree the nature or the number that were

caught. It depended on causes over which they had no control.

So the company of believers who constitute the kingdom of God, cannot determine who shall join them by a profession, or what their character shall be. As the fish that are enveloped in the deep waters of the sea are hid from the fishermen till they are drawn to land, and they are uncertain whether few or many will prove to be good; so those who in Christ's kingdom are employed in proclaiming the gospel, and calling men to profess faith in it, are unable to discern certainly what the character is of those who enter the visible church under their ministry. Their hearts are buried from the eyes of men in the depths of their own breasts, as the fish that are floating at random in the waters of the sea lie beyond the glance of those who draw the net that is at length to bear them to the shore. It is because the kingdom of heaven is what it is, and is proclaimed where it is, that men of various classes are drawn to place themselves professedly within its pale.

2. That fish of various and very dissimilar kinds were caught by the net, was natural and unavoidable, inasmuch as they inhabit the same waters, and necessarily, as it is in a large measure by preying on each other that they subsist.

So it is equally natural that persons of every character should be drawn by the kingdom of heaven to place themselves professedly among its members. There are motives that prompt the evil to it, as well as the good. Some are drawn to it by the example of friends; some by a false judgment of their character; some by the respectable position it gives them in society; some by the desire of wealth; and some by ambition of power; while others are led to it because they are renewed by the Spirit, and find in it such a Redeemer and such a redemption as they feel that they need, and as is infinitely worthy of God. A large train of the evil have thus in every age connected themselves with the true children of the kingdom. In the nations of Europe and western Asia, through a long series of centuries, all born of nominally Christian parents were baptized, and all who were baptized were considered as members of the church. Their entering it did not depend

at all on their religious or moral character. Such is the fact also at the present time in all the state Catholic and Protestant churches of Europe. Their being of the Christian community is no proof whatever, therefore, of their being the children of the kingdom of heaven. The prophecy of the parable has thus met with a vast and most impressive fulfilment. The crowds who wear the badge of the kingdom, like the fish taken in the net, are of every kind, and a large share of them are at the judgment to be thrown away.

3. As the good and bad fish remained together till the net was drawn to the shore, so the evil are to continue intermixed with the good in this world till the end of the age, or present dispensation; and the separation that is then to be made, is of the living population of the globe, who then profess to be the children of the kingdom: not of the whole series who have borne the name of Christ's disciples from the institution of the kingdom to his second coming. Those of the two classes who from age to age have died, will already have been separated from each other, and entered in their intermediate state on their several rewards. The severance here predicted, is to take place in this world, and is that foreshown by Christ, Matt. xxv. 31-46, of those of the living nations who at his advent profess to belong to his kingdom. Such a separation of the evil from the good at that epoch is repeatedly predicted in the New Testament; and it is the only separation of the two classes that is foreshown in the Sacred Word.

4. The separation of the two classes is to be made by the angels, who, it is shown, chap. xvi. 27; Mark viii. 38; 2 Thess. i. 7, are to accompany Christ at his revelation from heaven in flaming fire to take vengeance on those that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord; and whom Christ foretells, Matthew xxiv. 31, he will then send forth with the great sound of a trumpet to gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. This indicates that it is to be the epoch of a new age, in which manifestations are to be made of the divine presence, dominion, and righteousness, such as the world has never yet seen. What awe, wonder, joy, and gratitude will swell the hearts of the righteous, at finding themselves taken

by the hand by angels of light, and conducted to the presence of the Redeemer, there to be owned and accepted as his true disciples, and welcomed to the inheritance of his eternal kingdom! And what terror and dismay will seize and overwhelm the wicked, at finding themselves in the resistless grasp of those messengers of vengeance, to be dragged to the tribunal of the Saviour whom they have rejected, condemned as his enemies, and hurled down the steep of eternal ruin! This momentous office, which the angels are to fill, shows that they are to have a knowledge of the character of the two classes, that greatly transcends any that we now possess. How they are to acquire that perfect perception of the heart of each individual whom they lead to the bar of judgment; whether it is to be but the work of their natural powers, or what seems far more probable, by a revelation by the Spirit, or perhaps through the countenance of each individual from a consciousness either of union to Christ, or alienation from him, lighting up the features with joyousness and hope, or darkening them with terror and despair.

5. As the fish that were not suitable for food were not simply rejected, but were thrown away—that is, cast at a distance where they would not offend the senses—so the wicked, on their being separated from the righteous, and judged according to their character, are to be removed from the earth, to a world appropriated to the punishment of the evil, where they will cease to annoy God's children, or make war on his kingdom. Their continued presence and revolt in the world are wholly inconsistent with the administration that is then to be exercised by Christ, who, being to reign visibly on the earth, the open rebellion of enemies in his presence will be as incompatible with his glory, as a like open revolt in heaven would be.

The great lessons taught by the parable thus are: First: That in the present age but a part of those who nominally belong to the Kingdom of God are his true children. The evil are intermixed with the righteous, and in such a manner, that men are not able accurately to distinguish them.

Secondly: That this intermixture of the wicked with the righteous in the Christian community is to continue till the

end of this age or dispensation, when Christ is to come and institute a new rule over the world.

Thirdly: That the millennium, or reign of Christ with the saints on the earth during a prophetic thousand years, is not to take place till after Christ's second coming. The fancy generally entertained that all nations are to be converted anterior to his coming, is not only unauthorized by the Scriptures, but is directly at war with their plain teachings.

Fourthly: That the openly wicked in the nominal kingdom of Christ, at his coming, are not to be renewed and made true children of the kingdom, but are to be destroyed. They are the same parties as are represented by the tares which are to be burned, and by the man of sin who is to be consumed by the breath of Christ's mouth, and destroyed by the brightness of his coming.

Fifthly: That the visible presence of Christ, the ministry of angels in gathering the good and evil for judgment, the banishment of Satan, and the removal of the wicked from the earth, will distinguish that period in the most resplendent manner from this, and entitle it in the noblest sense to be denominated a new age; the reign of heaven on earth; the time of God's residence with men.

Sixthly: That the anguish of the wicked at the doom that is to be assigned them, is to be poignant in the extreme, and unalleviated by hope. They are to wail at their loss of the kingdom of heaven: they are to gnash their teeth in desperation at the punishments which have been assigned them.

#### IX. THE HOUSEHOLDER.

Matthew xiii. 53.

"Jesus said unto them, Understand ye all these things? They said unto him, Yea, Lord. And he said to them, before every scribe instructed in respect to the kingdom **en**, is like a householder who brings out of his things new and old."

though not called a parable by the evangelist, is as  
as that respecting the mustard seed, the hid treasure. Its design, however, is not to exemplify

the kingdom of heaven, but to illustrate the ability of a Jewish religious teacher, who well understood the nature of the kingdom of heaven, to give new and impressive instruction on sacred themes.

A scribe was a teacher or expounder of the Hebrew law. The things which Christ asks his disciples if they understood, were the things taught in the preceding parables. What he says, therefore, is, that an expositor of the Hebrew law, who was also instructed in respect to the kingdom of heaven, would be able to teach truths both new and old, like the head of a family, who brings out of his storehouse either new or old wine as he pleases, fresh or preserved fruits, and grain just ripened, or of the harvests of former years. A householder or head of a family, with a numerous train of descendants and servants, had often a large stock in his store-house of the products of their labors; and not merely of wines, fruits, and grain of different ages, but of flax from his field, and wool from his flocks, wrought by the females of his family into useful and elegant fabrics, and often into garments; utensils also of gold, silver, copper, and wood; and gems and jewels for the ornament of the head and hand; so that he could spread a sumptuous repast for his guests, and cause his family to appear in rich and tasteful dresses.

The point therefore established by the parable is, that the Jewish expositor of the law, who was also well acquainted with the things of the kingdom of heaven, would be able to present to those who listened to his teachings an equally rich display of novel as well as familiar truths, and in a form eminently adapted to awaken interest and give delight. It was addressed to the disciples—not to the multitude who had heard the preceding parables—and was designed to give beauty and dignity to the office of heralds of the kingdom of God to which they were called, and to prompt them to endeavor to understand and treasure up the instructions which Christ gave them respecting that kingdom which he had come to proclaim and establish. And the comparison was eminently suited to please the taste of Israelites, to whom a patriarch, or the head of a family, with a numerous retinue of offspring and servants, enriched with fields, herds, flocks, harvests, gold and silver, gems, and the products of the needle and loom, which they were accustomed to

accumulate, and display at their feasts, was a personage of the greatest dignity ;—the beau-ideal of a great, happy, and honorable man.

#### X. THE UNMERCIFUL SERVANT.

Matthew xviii. 21–35.

“Then Peter came to him and said: Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Till seven times? Jesus saith unto him: I say not unto thee, until seven times; but, until seventy times seven.

“In this respect the kingdom of heaven is like to a king who would reckon with his servants. And when he had begun to reckon, a debtor for ten thousand talents was brought to him. And as he had not the money for the payment, his lord commanded that he should be sold, and his wife and children, and all that he had, and payment made. Whereupon the servant fell down and paying reverence to him, said: Lord, have forbearance with me, and I will pay thee all. And touched with compassion the lord of that servant released him, and remitted him the debt. But that servant went out, and found one of his fellow servants who owed him a hundred pence. And seizing him, he throttled him, and said: Pay me what you owe. Whereupon his fellow-servant fell down, and entreated him, saying: Be forbearing with me, and I will pay you all. Yet he would not, but went and cast him into prison until he should pay what was due. His fellow-servants, however, saw what was done, and were much grieved; and went and informed their lord of all that had taken place. Then his lord called him and said to him: Thou wicked servant! I remitted you all that debt when you entreated me. And ought you not to be compassionate to your fellow-servant, even as I was merciful to you? And his lord was angry and delivered him to the prison-keepers, till he should pay the whole that was due to him. So also will my Father in heaven do unto you, unless you every one forgive his brother from your hearts their offences.”

Peter seems to have been led to his inquiry how often he should forgive a brother who sinned against him, by the

command which Christ had just addressed to his hearers, that if a brother trespassed against any one, he who was injured should go and talk privately with him, and induce him if possible to desist from the wrong he had done; that if unsuccessful, he should go with witnesses and repeat his remonstrance; and that if the offender still proved incorrigible he should make it known to the congregation of worshippers to which they belonged; and finally, if he refused to hear them, that he should be disowned as a brother, and treated as a Gentile. This appears to have suggested the question to Peter, whether, on the supposition that an offending brother always repented on being appealed to by the injured one, in the manner Christ directed, no matter how frequent it might be, he was always to be forgiven, or whether there was a limit, beyond which forgiveness ceased to be a duty. And Christ having answered that he should forgive his repentant brother, not merely seven times, but seventy times seven; that is for every offence of which he repented, no matter how numerous they were; he spoke this parable to enforce the duty by exemplifying the evil of an unforgiving spirit towards men on the one hand, and the certainty, on the other, that it will debar those who indulge it from forgiveness by God for their offences against him. The conduct of a human monarch towards an unforgiving servant who had been treated with great mercy by him, is used to represent the course which God will pursue towards such as, while they are indebted for the greatest blessings to his forbearance and pity, are merciless and revengeful towards those who offend against them.

1. The first point which needs to be illustrated, is the resemblance of the relation which a monarch bears to his servants, to that which God sustains to men as his moral subjects. It becomes a monarch to call his servants to whom he intrusts his own or the public property, to account, and require them to pay to him, as the representative of the nation, the property with which they, as collectors or disbursers of the revenue, have been intrusted. Not to do it, would be to neglect a duty of his station, to wrong those from whom the money was drawn, and tempt those who have control of the national funds to infidelity to their trusts, and to frauds.



In like manner, God will hold all those who profess to belong to his kingdom responsible for their conduct towards him and one another, and treat them according to the spirit in which they act.

2. The servant whose mercilessness the parable uses for exemplification, owed his lord ten thousand talents, or near ten millions of dollars probably; a sum far greater undoubtedly than all his property, if converted into money, would pay. It does not seem, however, that he denied that his indebtedness rose to that vast amount, or that he indicated any indisposition to appropriate all the means in his hands towards discharging it. He acknowledged his debt, and promised, if his lord were forbearing, that he would pay it all.

So men who profess to belong to the kingdom of heaven, are under liabilities to God because of their sins, which they are wholly unable to discharge. Nothing within the sphere of their powers can, by its worth, contribute in the slightest degree to extricate them from the thralldom in which their transgressions have involved them. Like the debtor for millions beyond his means, they must be freely forgiven, or else suffer the penalty of sin. And many of them at least are aware of this. They do not deny their guilt. They admit it, and promise, if forborne with, to take the steps which God enjoins in order to their deliverance. ●

3. The lord of the servant, on finding the great amount of his indebtedness, and that he was without money to pay it, ordered that he, his wife, his children, and all that he possessed, should be sold, and the proceeds appropriated to the payment of the debt. That was according to the custom of that age, when not only a debtor, but his wife and children, were considered as property, and were sold, if needful, into slavery, in order to discharge his debts. The monarch in this acted strictly in conformity with the laws, of which the debtor was aware, under which the debt was contracted.

In like manner God has a right to exact the penalty which his law assigns to sin. The forfeiture of all good, the subjection to immeasurable evil, is the just punishment of rebellion.

4. On the servant's imploring forbearance and promising, if allowed time, to pay the whole due, his lord not only set

him at liberty, but remitted him the debt: a generous and princely act, that should have softened the heart of the servant, and inspired him with a similar forbearance and generosity towards them who were his debtors.

Great, however, as the magnanimity of the monarch was to his servant, it was slight compared to the graciousness God exercises towards offenders who profess to belong to his kingdom. As his rights immeasurably transcend those of an earthly monarch; as the interests put in jeopardy by rebellion against him surpass the transient possessions of this world; as his attributes and his empire are of infinitely greater moment than those of the greatest earthly prince, so the guilt of unfaithfulness to him, and a misuse of his gifts, proportionally exceeds that of a wasteful and faithless servant towards a monarch who intrusts him with the care of his possessions and revenues.

5. After having been treated with this princely kindness, the servant exhibited a most unfeeling spirit in seizing and throttling his fellow-servant, and casting him into prison, because he could not immediately pay him the hundred pence that he owed him. Instead of being softened by the generosity he had experienced, he was hardened by it. His being released from the necessity of appropriating the money due him, as he received it, to discharge his debt to his lord, appears to have inflamed him with a more eager desire to get possession of it, that he might appropriate it to his pride, his love of luxury, or his ostentation. He showed, therefore, that he was no fit subject of such a monarch: that he had neither any sympathy with him nor care for the well-being of his servants, but was ready to outrage and crush them whenever he thought it would subserve his selfish ends. Instead of a grateful servant, he was an enemy of his monarch, and bent on the injury of his empire whenever it would answer his private and lawless purposes.

In like manner, one who, while professing to belong to the kingdom of God, and hoping to receive from him a free forgiveness of all his sins, is yet haughty, unforgiving, and revengeful towards those that have offended him, shows by his evil spirit that he is not a true child of the kingdom; but is an alien from its monarch, and an enemy to its well-being. In refusing to forgive a fellow-creature while he asks and

expects God to forgive him, he treats his rights as more sacred and inviolable than those of God; and offences against himself as more unpardonable than against him. It bespeaks, therefore, a most impious pride, and a most unscrupulous and audacious selfishness, and demonstrates that he is utterly unfit to be owned and rewarded as God's child. How unlike the spirit that should reign in one who implores and expects the Most High to forgive his sins, which are immeasurably more numerous and more guilty than any trespasses of men against himself! If he truly desires the Infinite Jehovah to stoop to his vileness and misery, and wash away his stains in the blood of Christ, and renew him in righteousness, how can he fail to see that it cannot be becoming in him to regard the weakness and sinfulness of fellow-creatures with haughtiness and resentment, and maintain towards them an attitude of vengeance and contempt? If he sincerely and fervently prays that God would forgive them and crown them with the blessings of his eternal kingdom, how can he avoid seeing that it is a flagrant contradiction to his prayer, not to pardon the trespasses against himself of which they may be guilty; that it is an impious presumption to ask of God what he is not himself willing to grant; and to treat that as suitable to the divine perfections, which he thinks unworthy of himself? A heart that is raised to a just sense of the greatness and sanctity of God's rights, that fervently longs for forgiveness, and is touched with the infinite beauty of God's condescension and love in bestowing it on so sinful and offensive a being, as it is conscious itself is, becomes animated, in a measure, with the same benignant and forgiving spirit, and sees the propriety and beauty of a forgiving disposition, and the unsuitableness and odiousness of a resentful and malevolent one. And such alone are fit for the kingdom of God. To admit to it the proud, the selfish, the cruel, and the wrongful, were to make it like the church in the present age, a world of sin, of treachery, of malice, and of misery; not of righteousness, peace, and salvation.

6. The other servants, on seeing how this ungrateful wretch, on being himself released from his great indebtedness, treated his fellow-servant who owed him but an insignificant sum, were grieved, and informed their lord of his procedure.

They felt it, to be an atrocious crime, in one who had received the generous treatment he had from his lord, and to bespeak a heart of such black ingratitude, such remorseless selfishness, as to make it impossible that they could respect, trust, or associate with him as a fellow-servant; and that fidelity to their lord required that they should apprise him of his crimes, that he might be visited with the punishment which he deserved.

In like manner, the true children of the kingdom, who realize and adore the goodness of God in forgiving their sins, see that a spirit of selfishness and cruelty towards one another is wholly unbecoming them, and that those who indulge it, give the most decisive proof that they are strangers to the benignant dispositions of the renewed heart, and unfit for the services, the society, and the joys of God's kingdom.

7. The lord of the servant, on hearing of his mercilessness, summoned him to his presence, expostulated with him for his want of pity, and delivered him to the prison-keepers till he should pay his whole debt. And that was the course of a just and wise monarch. The conduct of the servant was an insult to his lord. It was equivalent to a declaration that his forbearance and generousness were impolitic and weak: that a stern enforcement of his legal rights was the easiest course for a creditor. To have allowed him to go unpunished would have been to yield impunity to a consummate affront to himself, and sanction the merciless and malicious oppression of his weak subjects by those who had power over them. The vindication of himself, therefore, the proper manifestation of his hatred of hard-heartedness and cruelty, and the protection of his subjects, demanded that he should take that course.

So also God will summon those to his bar, who, though they profess to belong to his kingdom, are yet unforgiving and hard-hearted towards their fellow-men who trespass against them. Their un pitying and revengeful acts are a direct revolt from God, and an impeachment of his righteousness and wisdom, and proceed from a spirit that, if admitted into the kingdom of heaven, would make it a scene of mercilessness and misery, instead of righteousness and peace. God's own uprightness, therefore, and the well-being of his

kingdom, require that he should arraign and exact of them the full punishment of their sins.

The great lessons taught by the parable thus are: First: The odiousness and guilt of an unpitying spirit in those who owe all their blessings and hopes to the infinite pity of God. Harshness, relentlessness, and revenge in such, while basking in the smile of his mercy, and professedly looking to his boundless compassion for exemption from eternal death, present the strongest contrast possible to his forbearance and love, reveal a heartless ingratitude in circumstances that invest it with the greatest baseness and atrocity, and show in the most decisive forms a total unfitness for that kingdom which is to consist of love, of righteousness, and of peace.

Secondly: The certainty that God will exact the penalty of their sins from those who, while they profess to accept the boundless mercy of a free forgiveness by him of all their offences, which unpardoned consign them to eternal death, forgive not the comparatively slight offences of their fellow-men against themselves, but pursue them with a merciless harshness and revenge. The forgiveness, the sincere and full forgiveness of those who trespass against us, is the condition of our obtaining forgiveness by God; and to the heart-broken with a sense of sin, and renewed after the divine image, though sometimes under very severe injuries, costing a struggle, it is usually, especially in moments of intimate communion with God, easy and joyous to forgive. The infinite beauty that invests the forbearance, the condescension, the loving-kindness of God in forgiving the innumerable sins of which it is conscious, and raising it to the rank of an accepted child and heir of his kingdom, is felt to belong in a measure to acts of forgiveness exercised towards fellow men, and prompts to it with freeness and gladness.

ART. V.—THE SENTIMENTS OF DR. COTTON MATHER  
 “CONCERNING THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST, THE  
 NEW HEAVENS AND NEW EARTH,” AS GIVEN BY HIS SON  
 AND BIOGRAPHER, SAMUEL MATHER.

BY THE REV. H. CARLETON.

It is presumed that no person will deny that there is at this time so strong a dislike to the Millenarian Doctrine, that whoever embraces it has reason to expect to share less in the affections and confidence of a very large proportion of the members of the Presbyterian and Congregational churches. It will be surmised that his mind is not well balanced; that he is liable to be led astray by new notions; that he does not possess the power of discriminating between truth and error; or that, through a want of independence, he is liable to be misled by others. This prejudice against Millenarians no doubt would, to a certain extent, be removed, if Christian ministers and the laity were better acquainted with the history of the doctrine which is so much disliked. And indeed there has been a favorable change in this respect within one or two years. The revival of the ancient doctrine respecting the second appearing of Christ, the resurrection of the saints to reign with him, and of the New Heavens and New Earth, occurred under very unfavorable circumstances. As the inquiry on this subject commenced at a time when many were agitated by the extravagances and errors of the followers of Mr. Miller; and as he coincided with Millenarians in respect to some essential elements of their religious faith, many persons have supposed that Millenarianism is nothing more than Millerism in another form. Furthermore, for some cause, Christians of this generation have not had their attention called to the subject; and when it was preached or promulgated through the press, it was received as a new doctrine, and met with special opposition from those who are distinguished for conservatism. In addition, a new sentiment had obtained a strong hold on the minds of many Christians, to which Millenarianism is antagonistical. Contrary to the belief of Christians in all former times, the expectation is indulged

that the prevalence of misbelief, and wickedness, and consequent disorder and misery, will gradually yield to the force of truth disseminated by the energy of the Christian church, and that the latter day of peace and holiness will be imperceptibly ushered in. But many have seen their mistake. They have learned that Millenarians have been the most reluctant to make innovations; that the doctrine which they cherish has an easy and natural connexion with the "faith once delivered to the saints;" that they are almost without exception firm supporters of orthodoxy; and of all men the most seldom found "doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds."—1 Tim. vi. 4, 5. It has been found that the first Christians were Millenarians, and that very many of the Puritan Fathers received the same doctrine; that those who are called modern Millenarians, for obvious reasons, do not shrink from a comparison of the history of their doctrine with that of their opponents. The result is, Millenarians are not regarded with so much distrust and aversion as they have been.

It is hoped that the appearance in the Journal of the sentiments of Dr. Mather respecting the Second Coming of Christ, the Resurrection of the Saints, and the New Heavens and the New Earth, will awaken a more earnest inquiry respecting facts so interesting, and in which all true believers will find their everlasting joy and rejoicing. We should indeed make it our first care to be united to Christ by faith; "to be found in him" renewed in his image. But no right-minded Christian will doubt the propriety of holding constantly in our minds and affections the end of our faith, even the glorious appearing of our Lord, and the perfection of the saints, who shall be admitted into his presence.

We have another reason for presenting the statement of Dr. Mather's sentiments on this subject. We wish to bring to the notice of the readers of the Journal those considerations which have influenced the opinions of men who have lived at different periods, and which give a certain assurance of the revelation of facts which constitute the elements, and we may say substance of what is peculiar to Millenarians. Our opponents accuse us of disagreeing among

ourselves. This ought not to cause great uneasiness, since it has ever been the standing argument of Catholics against all Protestants. And furthermore, it is no strange thing that persons who think independently, and who, for themselves, derive their religious opinions from the sacred Scriptures, should have some differences among themselves. But yet it is a fact worthy to be noted, that Millenarians are very harmonious in their belief of those facts which are objects of revelation, while they sometimes disagree in their attempts to obviate difficulties which necessarily invest subjects beyond our comprehension. We would not have the readers of the Journal think that we in all respects coincide with the sentiments of Dr. Mather. As it is not our object to present a review of his position on this subject, we shall endeavor to invite attention to what we receive, rather than to attempt a refutation of what we reject.

Mr. Mather's biographer, in presenting the views of his father respecting the "Sacred Prophecies," says:

"I will here write those sentiments of these things of which the Doctor, just before he died, had a firm belief from a strict inquiry, long study, and much prayer; and, as near as I can, I will express his sentiments in his own words in the following assertions:—

1. "The *Second Coming* of the Lord will be *at and for* the destruction of the *man of sin*, and the extinction of the *Roman monarchy* under the *Papal form* of it. He thought that, although wise men interpreted our Saviour's *coming in the clouds of heaven*, and the *brightness* of his *appearance*, as if it meant anything besides *His* personal coming, herein they spoke foolishly and unaccountably. For as their interpretations leave us destitute of any proof that our Lord will *ever come at all*, so they go very far towards a trespass on the *third commandment*."

2. "The *conflagration*, described by the oracles of God in strong terms, and which we are warned of by *the mouth of all the prophets*, this conflagration will be at the second coming of the LORD. To make the *Petrine conflagration* signify no more than the laying of Jerusalem and her daughter in ashes; and to make the new heavens and the new earth signify no more than *the church state of the gospel*, these are shameful hallucinations. And as for the new earth, b: ore



the arrival of which no man can reasonably expect *happy* times for the church of God upon earth, it is the greatest absurdity to say that it will take place before the Petrine conflagration. And there is no prospect of arguing to any purpose with such as can talk so very ridiculously."

3. "Upon *the conflagration* the glorious GOD will *create* new heavens and a new earth. In the upper part of our *atmosphere*, where will be the *new heavens*, there will be the *holy city* which GOD has prepared for his people. This *holy city* will be inhabited by the *raised saints* attending on our SAVIOUR there, and receiving the inconceivable recompenses of all their services and sufferings for Him. The *new earth* will be a Paradise, prepared for another people, and full of the goodness of the LORD."

4. "It is impossible to find any inhabitants for the new earth, but a set of people that shall escape the *conflagration*. It is a thing plainly revealed unto us that our descending Redeemer, while yet at a further distance than he will even come when he sets *fire* to the earth, will by his Almighty voice *raise* the dead, whom he intends for blessedness, and so fetch them to him as to *bring them with him*: as he is going on in his nearer approaches with his illustrious retinue to give order for the tremendous fire, he will hear the cries of his chosen called and faithful ones, and he will send *his angels* to do for them as once for Elijah. These hundred and forty-four thousand servants of GOD and walkers with HIM, that have the MARK of GOD upon them when the destroyers are going to *hurt the earth*, shall be *caught up* to meet the LORD and with HIM shall be in safety while they shall see the *earth* flaming under them. These are they who shall return to the new earth, possess it, and people it; they shall soon multiply into mighty nations upon it."

5. „THE process of *judgment* on-the sheep and goats, in the *twenty-fifth* chapter of Matthew, has not one of the *raised from the dead* concerned in it; but it is a quick division and decision made by our LORD among the *Christians* who cry for *mercy* when they see the fire of GOD ready to seize upon them determining who shall be *caught up* to meet the LORD, and who shall be left to the *perdition of ungodly men in the flames* before them, and there shall not one *ungodly man* be left living in the world."

6. "THE raised saints in the new heavens will not marry nor be given in marriage, but be equal with the angels; the changed saints in the new earth will build houses and inhabit them, plant vineyards and eat the fruit of them, and will have an offspring that will be with them the blessed of the Lord; and if blessed, then sinless and deathless. The sacred Scriptures have expressly declared this difference between them."

7. "WHILE the holy people on the new earth shall be circumstanced like Adam and Eve in paradise, in a pure and spotless manner living unto GOD; the raised saints, being somewhat more angelically circumstanced, will be sent from time to time down from the new heavens unto them to be their teachers and rulers, and have power over nations, and the will of GOD will be done on earth as it is in heaven. This dispensation will continue at least a thousand years. Whether the translations from the new earth to the new heavens will be successively during the thousand years, or all together after it, has not been discovered."

8. "THE new heaven in conjunction with the new earth under the influence of it, is that heavenly country which the patriarchs looked for. When the great GOD promised them that he would be their GOD and bless them, they understood it of his bringing them into this deathless and sinless world. They who expect the rest promised for the church of GOD upon earth to be found anywhere but in the new earth, and they who expect any happy times for the church in a world that hath death and sin in it; those do err not knowing the Scriptures nor the kingdom of GOD."

We will now examine some of Dr. Mather's propositions, and compare them with Scripture, that we may determine whether he was warranted in giving them positively as the enunciation of undoubted fact. His biographer says:

"He thought that, although wise men have interpreted our Saviour's coming in the clouds of heaven, and the brightness of his appearance, as if it meant anything besides his personal coming herein, they spake foolishly and unaccountably. For as their interpretations leave us destitute of any proof that our Lord will ever come at all, so they go very far towards a trespass on the third commandment."

We will in the first place examine those Scriptures which

affirm the coming of Christ in the clouds, or in the clouds of heaven.

"I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came in the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him" (Dan. vii. 13). We will not here attempt to examine the import of this Scripture, but will first refer to other passages which speak of the coming of Christ in the clouds.

"Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said ; nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven" (Matt. xxvi. 64. See also Mark xiv. 62 ; Luke xxii. 69). This was the answer that Jesus gave to the high priest, who said unto him, "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ the Son of God." To this demand our Saviour gives an affirmative answer. He declared that he was. And he manifestly applies to himself the passage which we have quoted from Daniel. That is, he affirmed that he was the personage whom Daniel foresaw coming in the clouds of heaven, and he assured the high priest that he would be a spectator of his august approach. These passages refer to the same person and the same advent.

There is evidence that in the following passages the same coming of the Son of man is referred to which was described by the prophet. "And then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." "And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory." "And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud, with power and great glory." "Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him" (Rev. i. 7). The language in all these passages is nearly the same ; and those of them that are found in the New Testament are to be regarded as a repetition of that found in Daniel vii. 13, and a description of the same event. If that announces a literal coming, then a literal appearing is affirmed in the other Scriptures quoted above. But if the prophet saw only the representation of a manifestation of the divine power of the Saviour in the government of the world, and protecting and defending his church, then

our Saviour and his servant John spake of the same thing under the imagery of the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven. If there are other passages in which similar language is found, they do not teach a personal coming more plainly or conclusively than it is taught in those already quoted.

If it should be said that a literal coming of our Saviour in the clouds is affirmed (though not in form, yet in fact) in Acts i. 11, we could not deny it; yet we should say, if all other descriptions of his coming in the clouds refer to a providential coming, then, by applying the laws of language, or perhaps we should say by the abuse of the laws of language by which they are deprived of their obvious meaning, to this passage, we could make it signify about what we might wish to have it teach. On the other hand, if Acts i. 11 were the only reference to the coming of Christ in the clouds, we should be under an absolute necessity to derive from it a coming to reign personally on the earth. It is very generally believed that the Scriptures teach that Christ will come in the clouds of heaven literally, personally. But where is this fact taught? If it be not taught in the passages quoted, where is it taught? And if it is not taught in all of them, how shall we show that it is taught in any of them? Is the personal coming of Christ a mere tradition, which the Christian world have been united in receiving as an undoubted fact revealed in Scripture, while there is no passage to be found in which it is affirmed! Have Christians derived a literal fact from language which, when properly interpreted, they concede refers to no such thing, but only images forth some event under the government of God!

There are Scriptures which speak of the coming of Christ without the adjunct of "in the clouds," or "in the clouds of heaven." Do these describe a literal personal coming, or do they simply affirm a fact in his government of the world or his church? We will present some of these passages.

"And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains; for the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azal: yea, ye shall flee like as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah: and the Lord my God shall come *and* all the saints with thee" (Zech. xiv. 5). It will be presumed, that none of the readers of the Journal will

have any disposition to deny that Christ is the being who is designated in the phrase, "The Lord my God." Let it here be noted that it is said that his saints will come with him.

By referring to the New Testament we shall find that the coming of Christ with the saints is referred to as a fixed certainty, as clearly revealed, as from the use of similar language there is evidently a reference to the same coming here described, in the passages to which we shall now refer.

"Seeing *it is* a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day." (2 Thess. i. 6-10.) At this coming Christ is to be glorified in his saints, and, therefore, we may suppose that it synchronizes with his coming with his saints, foretold in Zechariah.

"And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these things, saying, behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints." (Jude v. 14.)

"But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits: afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." (1 Cor. xv. 23.) The language is varied a little here, but yet there can, we think, be no doubt that the same event is referred to. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will he bring with him." (1 Thess. iv. 14.) The sense, in substance, is here affirmed with what the prophet Zechariah saw. And we know that the resurrection of the just is referred to in the context, wherein there is a more full description of the august appearing, or coming of the Saviour with his saints.

"And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." (2 Thess. ii. 8.) "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy

angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." (Matt. xxv. 31.)

"Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." (2 Tim. iv. 8.) "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." (Heb. ix. 28.)

There are other passages in which the coming revelation or appearing of our Lord is foretold, but it is presumed that if a literal appearing be not declared by the texts already quoted, it cannot be proved from any other Scriptures. These references will, therefore, be amply sufficient for our purpose.

There is one fact to which we wish to direct the careful attention of the readers of the Journal. It is this: whenever Christ or any of the writers of the New Testament speak of his, then future, coming, they introduce it as an event previously revealed. We think in no instance is it mentioned or alluded to as a new revelation. It is one of the things everywhere assumed on the authority of a divine revelation, and one well known to all who knew the Old Testament Scriptures. And furthermore, there were certain familiar forms of expression which were employed when they spoke of it. Where did they find this event revealed? Was it in other sacred writings not known to us, or in a traditional account of divine communications? Most evidently not. The Old Testament Scriptures which we now have were their authority. They were the Scriptures of truth, to which they referred. And we think we hazard nothing in affirming that no other coming of our Lord is foretold in the New Testament than what had been foretold in the Old. But where in the Old Testament Scriptures is the second coming of Christ predicted, if not in the passages already referred to? Understand us. We do not deny that in very many places this event is predicted; but we do affirm, that if the passages quoted do not refer to a personal coming, such an appearing cannot be proven from any other. If we have not referred to those Scriptures which are the most clear and explicit on this subject, we have not done what

we wished, and what we have designed to do. Furthermore we have referred to those texts from which the writers of the New Testament seem evidently to have borrowed their language when speaking of the glorious appearing of the Lord. Indeed, the language employed in the Old Testament seems to have had the force of technical words or phrases with the writers of the New Testament. Do they refer to the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven? They employ the language of Daniel to give utterance to what they wish to communicate. Do they wish to speak of the saints as attendants on Christ at his advent? From Zechariah they obtain an expression which will unerringly indicate their meaning. We will further add, that if there are other Scriptures from which a future personal appearing of the Lord Jesus could be proved, though it should be made to appear that such a coming is not indicated in those referred to, we would thank any person to tell us where they are to be found.

Does any one say that some of the passages quoted teach a future personal advent, and some do not? Which do not? Are they those found in the Old Testament? But these are manifestly the very passages to which reference is had by the writers of the New Testament to prove that God had promised a literal coming. These are the passages from which they borrow their language when they speak of it: if, indeed, they anywhere do refer to such an appearing.

Which do declare a personal coming? Shall we say that it is taught in the following Scriptures? "Christ the first fruits: afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." "And unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." And where shall we look for a revelation of what is referred to in these passages, as a fixed certainty, if not to, "And the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee," and to other passages in which similar language is employed, and with like import? Let us say again, what text shall we select to prove that Christ will come again personally, while we must not, by following the laws of language, determine that such a coming is taught in all the texts we have referred to above?

If any of these prove that Christ will come personally, then they all do. And if these do not teach a literal ap-

pearing, then such an appearing cannot be found in the Scriptures. Are the readers of the Journal ready to discard this fundamental article of the Christian faith? We trust not. It is too dear to them, too clearly revealed in the Scriptures of truth, and too intimately connected with the judgment, the resurrection of the body, and the blessedness of the saints, to be abandoned for the sake of sustaining a favorite theory respecting what shall be before Christ shall appear.

But if a personal appearing of the Lord Jesus is taught in the Scriptures which we have quoted, and in similar passages, then it is obvious that that appearing will be "*at and for* the destruction of the man of sin," as maintained by Dr. Mather, and will be pre-millennial.● We have no need to prove that Dan. vii. 13; Zech. xiv. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 8, refer to events contemporaneous with the destruction of the man of sin, and the commencement of the reign of righteousness on the earth. Which shall we do? Shall we abandon the belief that the Scriptures teach that Christ will appear the second time literally, personally; or shall we admit the doctrine of the pre-millennial advent? One or the other we must do. We do talk "foolishly and unaccountably" [for we could not give a reason for what we should say], if we adhere to the belief of a personal coming, and at the same time refer all those Scriptures which represent that Christ will appear, will come, will be revealed, will come in the clouds of heaven, to something besides a literal appearing.

II. The positions of our author respecting the conflagration, and the new heavens, and the new earth, are worthy of consideration. He says:—

"To make the Petrine conflagration signify no more than the laying of Jerusalem and her daughter in ashes; and to make the new heavens and the new earth signify no more than the church state of the gospel,—these are shameful hallucinations; and as for the new earth, before the arrival of which no man can reasonably expect happy times for the church of God upon earth, it is the greatest absurdity to say that it will take place before the Petrine conflagration. And there is no prospect of arguing to any purpose with such as can talk so very ridiculously."

Let us examine these statements by the Scriptures of truth.



It will be recalled to attention, if possible, where the prophet foretold the new earth and new earth-dweller. We have seen that scriptural statements that are indicated by these new earth-dwellers, and by the prophets under different figures, only indicate the new earth and the new earth-dweller to exist. The new heavens and the new earth are presented in the following Scripture.

"I will build I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall be forgotten, and I will create men." Isa. lxxv. 17. It is evident that the race of men will continue, and that children will be born after this creation, and that they will inhabit the new earth: for the prophet describes the condition of those who dwell upon it as follows. "But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create: for I will build I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy. And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy with my people: and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying. There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: for the child shall die an hundred years old: but the sinner shall be accursed. And they shall build houses and inhabit them: and they shall plant vineyards and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build and another inhabit: they shall not plant and another eat: for as the days of a tree, are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth for trouble; for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them. And it shall come to pass, that before they call I will answer: and while they are yet speaking I will hear. The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock: and dust shall be the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord" (Isa. lxxv. 18-25).

Should any say this is a description of heavenly things after the human race shall cease to propagate itself, and the earth shall have been annihilated, it were useless to attempt to refute them: for when men maintain opinions without reason, a wise man will not expect to win them by arguments. "For as the

new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain." (Isaiah lxvi. 22.) Here, also, it is manifest that the new earth is the abode of men who live upon the products of the earth, and who have bodies of flesh as we have. But we would remark that we learn from the context that previous to the creation of the new heavens and the new earth there will be a terrific destruction of wicked men. The prophet says, "And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring to all flesh." (Isa. lxvi. 24.) This destruction and burning is more fully set forth in 2 Peter iii., to which we refer below.

When will the state of things indicated by the terms New Heaven and New Earth exist? Does the Christian church now inhabit the new earth, and are we now surrounded by the new heavens? Certainly the present state of things is no way answerable to the description given above.

We will now refer you to another passage in which the new heavens and the new earth are spoken of. "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." (2 Peter iii. 12.) Where are the new heavens and new earth promised? Without any doubt, in the Scriptures already quoted. We will now inquire again when will they be made? The context gives the answer. It will be after the conflagration, when "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and all the works therein, shall be burned up." (2 Peter iii. 10.) At that time the apostle says will be "the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." (2 Peter iii. 7.)

We suppose there are those who will say that the prediction respecting the conflagration of the earth and the elements was fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem, and that the new heavens and new earth now exist. But was the earth deluged with fire? and did the elements melt with fervent heat when Jerusalem was destroyed, as the windows of heaven were opened, and the old world was overflowed with water at the flood? Certainly no such thing occurred

when Jerusalem was overthrown But the conflagration described by Peter will be universal, like the flood in the days of Noah.

"Knowing this first that there shall come in the last days scoffers walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming; for since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation? For this they are willingly ignorant of that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water, whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished. But the heavens and the earth, which are now by the same word, are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men?" If it had been designed to foreshow in the Scriptures the destruction of Jerusalem, when it was overthrown by the Romans, it would seem to have been more appropriate to have represented the Jews as willingly ignorant that Jerusalem had been ever destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. There is so much violence done to language by making this conflagration a description of the burning of Jerusalem, and the new heavens and the new earth, identical with the present state of the Christian church, that we exceedingly wonder why those who thus interpret this Scripture are not so much ashamed of their interpretation that they refuse to acknowledge it as their own. It is presumed that none of the readers of the Journal have such views of the import of the passage.

Let it be noted that the conflagration here described will be at the second coming of Christ; for in reference to it the scoffers will say, "Where is the promise of his coming?" Again it will be at the day of judgment, frequently mentioned in the Scriptures, as is clearly indicated in the following—"Reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." Hence it appears that at the coming of Christ the earth will be burned, ungodly men will be judged and doomed to perdition, and subsequently an order of things will be instituted denominated new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Now, if we turn back to Isaiah, where the new heavens and the new earth, which Peter speaks of, were promised, we shall

find that on the new earth they "shall build houses and inhabit *them*; and they shall plant vineyards and eat the fruit of them;" that children will be born, for "they shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth for trouble, for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them." The earth will therefore be inhabited by a race of men who shall live upon the fruits of it. Does what is described in these passages exist now, or will it in the millennial state? If we say it exists now, then the coming of Christ is already passed, the judgment is passed, and no better state of things is to be looked for upon the earth. Is it future, but after the millennial period? Then between the present time and the creation of the new heavens and the new earth there will be a space of at least a thousand years of great peace and prosperity to the church, when Satan shall not deceive the nations.

But we are commanded to watch for the appearing of Christ here predicted, for we know not that he will not come this day. If, however, the Lord has revealed in the Scriptures that his appearing will be at least a thousand years from this time, we do know certainly that he will not come in our day unless we live a thousand years. Furthermore, the conflagration described by Peter will be at that coming of Christ, foretold by the prophets and confirmed by himself and his apostles, when he shall by the brightness of his appearing destroy the man of sin or the persecuting power which John puts before the millennium, or at its commencement. There will be no long period of peace and godly prosperity to the church before the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven. The Scriptures speak of no such happy times before that event. On the contrary, they represent that the enemy will triumph until the appearance of the Son of man in the clouds. But when the apostle saw in vision the righteous dead rising to reign with Christ a thousand years, did he not have a prophetic view of great peace, joy, and blessedness? Since, therefore, a happy state to the church will commence at the beginning of the thousand years, we must conclude that then the new heavens and the new earth will be created, to continue not a thousand years only, but for ever.

We would earnestly invite attention to the declaration of

Dr. Mather that—"No man can reasonably expect happy times for the church of God upon earth before the 'arrival' of the new earth." Are such times anywhere foretold by the prophets? Are they foretold in the New Testament? Where in all the Scriptures are we taught that there will be any period, however brief, or a thousand years of peace, of true blessedness to the church of Christ, before the promised new heaven and new earth shall be created? Nowhere can such a prediction be found. On the contrary, from the prophets, from the parables of our Saviour, from all his teachings, from the revelations made to his servants, we learn that the church must be surrounded by the enemies of God, must be afflicted with false brethren until God shall renovate the earth.

But when he creates the new heavens and the new earth he will send Jesus according to his promise. And his saints will come with him and will reign with him.

In conclusion, we would ask the readers of the *Journal* whether they have ever considered the import of the petition in the Lord's prayer, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." Can this be before the creation of the new heavens and the new earth; before the saints shall be raised and made equal unto the angels; before the Lord shall come with them, and the inhabitants of the earth shall be all righteous? Must we not have as much as this in our minds if we sincerely pray for what is indicated in this petition? And if Christ has taught us to pray for this, may we not suppose that it is predicted in the Scriptures, so that we can pray, believing in the divine word that our prayer shall be answered? Here is a marvelous thing! While millenarians are few and their doctrine is much spoken against, the whole Christian world daily pray for the accomplishment of all that is embraced in the millenarian doctrine! Is not this so? And are not our opponents with us when they draw near to God in humble worship, and in their supplications give utterance to the most intense, the most earnest longings of their souls?

**ART. VI.—A DESIGNATION AND EXPOSITION OF THE  
FIGURES OF ISAIAH, CHAPTERS XXX. AND XXXI.****CHAPTER XXX.**

THE prophet first inveighs against those who deserted Jehovah, and sent ambassadors to Egypt to purchase help; and predicts the disappointment and shame in which the policy was to end. He then contrasts with the disastrous results of their reliance on men, the safety, prosperity, and peace they were to enjoy, when God should interpose and give them redemption by his Almighty arm.

1, 2. Hypocatastases. "Woe to the rebellious children, saith Jehovah, who form a plan but not from me; who cover with a covering, but not by my Spirit, that they may add sin to sin;" v. 1. To form a plan of policy without taking counsel of Jehovah, was an act of apostasy from him—to turn to men for protection was to renounce him as their covenant God, and transfer their trust from him to them. To cover with a covering, denoting a studied and specious concealment, is used by hypocatastasis to signify that they veiled their plan from the public eye, and kept it a secret, so that to the sin of apostasy from God they added also the sin of hypocrisy and deception towards men.

3. Metaphor in the use of add. The two sins were not literally added together, like arithmetical numbers, or drops of water, so as to become one; that was impossible. The verb is used by a metaphor, to indicate simply that they were conjoined, and belonged to the same scheme of agency.

4. Metonymy of mouth, for Jehovah himself—"Who walk to go down to Egypt, but have not asked my mouth; to strengthen themselves with the strength of Pharaoh, and to trust in the shadow of Egypt;" v. 2. They designed to form an alliance with the Egyptian monarch, and relied on him for defence, instead of Jehovah.

5. Elliptical metaphor in the ascription of a shadow to Egypt, in which the Israelites desired to place themselves for protection from the evils to which they were exposed.

6. Elliptical metaphor, in attributing a shadow to Egypt

in which the Israelites might find shelter as from the heat of the sun. "But the strength of Egypt shall be to you for shame, and your trust in the shadow of Egypt for confusion;" v. 3. The folly and guilt of their procedure was to become so manifest as to confound them, and cover them with blushes.

"For his princes are in Zoan, and his ambassadors arrive at Hanes; all are ashamed of a people who cannot profit them; a people not for help and not for profit, but for shame and also a reproach;" v. 4, 6. Zoan, the Tanais of the Greeks, was an ancient city of Lower Egypt, and a royal residence. The court was doubtless there at the time, and the ambassadors were Pharaoh's, sent to meet those of the Israelitish monarch at Hanes, which was somewhat nearer Judea.

The prophet next describes the journey of the Israelitish ambassadors with presents to the monarch of Egypt to purchase his alliance. "The burden of the beasts of the south in a land of suffering and distress, whence are the adder and the fiery flying serpent; they are carrying on the shoulder of young asses their wealth, and on the hump of camels their treasures to a people who cannot profit;" v. 6. The land of distress is the wilderness which separates Palestine from Egypt: and it is described to show the unsuitableness of the means which the Israelites had chosen for their security. The very journey the ambassadors were to make to reach Egypt was one of extreme peril. In forsaking Jehovah, they forsook the only being who could defend them; and exposed themselves to severe deprivations and great dangers, in bearing away their treasures to purchase an ally who would yield them no aid.

"For the Egyptians shall help in vain and to no purpose: Therefore have I cried concerning this—Their strength is to sit still;" v. 7. Their ability to meet their dangers—their safety depended on their continuing their trust in Jehovah. Every step they took towards forming an alliance with Egypt, carried them from security into weakness and danger.

7. Metaphor in the use of mouth. "Now, go write it before them in a tablet, and inscribe it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever:—That this

is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord: which say to the seer see not; and to the prophets, prophesy not unto us right things: speak unto us smooth things; prophesy deceits;" v. 8-10. As that which is smooth to the touch is pleasing, by smooth things from the prophets are meant predictions or announcements that met the tastes of the apostates. This demand at one time that the seers should not see the visions which God presented to them; and at another, that they should accommodate their messages to the wishes of the rebellious and lying children whom they addressed, and directly pervert and desecrate their office by prophesying deceits, indicates a most bold and daring impiety. The leaders were not content with simply apostatizing from God; they undertook to prostitute the prophetic office to their purposes, and give, in appearance at least, the sanction of Jehovah to their wickedness; in the hope thereby, probably, of calming the fears of the doubting, and making their measures acceptable to the people.

8, 9. Hypocatastases. "Get you out of the way; turn aside out of the path: cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us;" v. 11. This is still addressed to the prophets. To get out of the way and turn aside from the path, are hypocatastases, for violating the law of their office, by false announcements, or declining to make any announcements at all. The command to cause the Holy One to cease from before them, seems to mean that the prophets should refuse to deliver any messages from him, and perhaps declare that he no longer made any communications to them: that the apostates might be left, apparently, without obstruction, to follow their own counsels.

10, 11. Comparisons. "Therefore, thus saith the Holy One of Israel, Because of your rejection of this word, and ye have trusted in oppression and perverseness and have relied thereon; therefore shall this iniquity be to you like a breach that is ready to fall, swelling out in a high wall, whose breaking may come suddenly, at an instant. And it shall be broken as the breaking of a potter's vessel that is dashed in pieces: he shall not spare; so that there shall not be found in the breaking a sherd to take fire from the hearth, or to dip water from a pool;" v. 13, 14. Their apostasy



from Jehovah, and alliance with the Egyptians, and impious expedients to give it effect, instead of adding to their strength, instantly placed them in a condition of weakness and danger, like a wall of a city, which instead of standing erect and firm, is swelling out, and ready to fall at any instant, and leave the inhabitants who rely on it for safety, exposed to the unobstructed inroads of the enemy.

12. Elliptical metaphor, in the use of returning, a movement in space, for becoming obedient. "For thus saith the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel; in returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength; and ye would not," v. 15. By returning is doubtless meant a return to their allegiance to Jehovah; the rest to which they were to return was an abstinence from attempts to protect themselves by the Egyptian alliance;—the sitting still which it had before been declared was their strength. By refraining from endeavors to defend themselves by unlawful means, and calmly confiding in God, they would have his omnipotence on their side, and be shielded at once from conquest and from danger.

13, 14. Comparisons. "But ye said no: for we will flee upon horses; therefore shall ye flee. And we will ride upon the swift; therefore shall they that pursue you be swift; one thousand at the rebuke of one; at the rebuke of five shall ye flee; till ye be left as a mast on the top of a mountain, and as an ensign on a hill," v. 16, 17. The design of the comparison seems to be to indicate the smallness of the number that would remain. They were to flee, and be pursued to destruction, till the survivors would be like a mast or signal pole on the top of a mountain, which is specially distinguishable and conspicuous, because it stands alone; no other object rising nigh it to obstruct the beholder's eye or divide his attention. The panic with which they were to be struck, was to be such that no numbers either of their own troops or of the allies whom they might call to their assistance, would contribute at all to their safety. Not only would a thousand be thrown into a rout at the rebuke of one, but five of the enemy would drive the whole of them into a flight. What picture of the disastrous results of war commenced with an impious contempt of God, ever transcended this?

The prophet now proceeds to predict, that because of the great punishments he was thus to inflict on them, he would wait for a period before he interposed to restore them to safety and peace.

15. Hypocatastasis in the use of an exaltation of God in place, for a brighter display of his attributes. "And therefore will the Lord wait that he may be gracious unto you, and therefore will he be exalted, that he may have mercy on you. For the Lord is a God of judgment, blessed are all they that wait for him," v. 18. The reason that God would wait before he manifested his grace to them was, the terrible calamities with which he was thus to overwhelm them; and they are the calamities, it would seem from the promises that follow, that have filled up the long space that has since intervened; and it is by the display of his justice through this vast series of ages, and verification of the truth of his word, that the way is preparing for their restoration as his chosen people.

"For the people in Zion shall dwell at Jerusalem: thou shalt weep no more; he shall be very gracious unto thee at the voice of thy cry: when he shall hear it, he will answer thee," v. 19. This indicates more than a mere release from the evils of a disastrous war. It implies their repentance and a return to God, a manifestation of his great grace, their restoration to Zion as their residence, and exemption for ever from sorrow. No such change in their character and relation to him has yet taken place. It is undoubtedly still future.

"Though Jehovah will give you bread of affliction, and water of adversity, yet no more shall thy teachers hide themselves, but thine eyes shall see thy teachers," v. 20. This refers, it is probable, to the period that is immediately to precede their repentance and conversion. It is to be a time of great difficulty and affliction from their enemies; yet they are to have teachers who will not suppress their messages from God, as the prophets were compelled by the apostate party not to proclaim his word in respect to the alliance with Egypt; but they will present themselves openly to the people and perform their office with fidelity.

16. Hypocatastasis. "And thine ears shall hear a word from behind thee, saying, This is the way; walk ye in it,

when ye turn to the right, and when ye turn to the left," v. 21. A way in which they were to walk is put for the divine commands which they were to make the rule of their life. The voice from behind them, as from the cloud that followed the Israelites in their passage through the Red Sea, is to direct them to obey those commands, although the course which they enjoin seems to be a deflection sometimes to the right hand, and sometimes to the left.

17. Apostrophe. "And ye shall defile the covering of thy graven images of silver, and the ornament of thy molten images of gold: thou shalt cast them away as an abominable thing. Begone! thou shalt say to it," v. 22. This disgust with their idols is frequently predicted as to mark the period of God's intervention to convert and redeem them: as chap. ii. 18-20; xxxi. 7. God is then to crown them with abundance and prosperity in their land.

"And he shall give the rain of thy seed with which thou shalt sow thy ground, and of the increase of the earth, and it shall be rich and plenteous. In that day shall thy cattle feed in large pastures. And the oxen and the asses that work the ground, shall eat salted provender which has been winnowed with the sieve and fan. And there shall be on every high mountain, and on every elevated hill, channels, streams of water, in the day of great slaughter, when the towers fall," v. 23, 24, 25. It is given as a mark of the ease and abundance that are to distinguish that period, that the cattle that labor in the culture of the earth are not to be dependent for their sustenance on the produce of the pastures, but are to be fed on grain that is to be winnowed from chaff, and made still more tasteful by the addition of salt. The day of great slaughter, and the fall of the towers, it is shown in other passages, is to be the day of Christ's visible interposition to destroy his haughty enemies, and restore the Israelites to their ancient land. As chap. ii. 12-15: "For there is a day to Jehovah of hosts upon or against everything that is high and lofty, and upon everything exalted, and it comes down; and on all the cedars of Lebanon, and on all the oaks of Basan; and upon all the high mountains, and upon all the elevated hills, *and upon every high tower*, and upon every fenced wall; and upon all ships of Tarshish, and upon all images of desire." Also chap. lxvi. 15-17. That

there is then to be a tempest of rain, hail, and fire, is also foreshown, Ezekiel xxxviii. 22. "And I will rain upon him, and upon his bands, and upon the many people that are with him, an overflowing rain, and great hail-stones, fire and brimstone." And that the streams on the mountains are to be confined to that epoch seems clear, from their predicted existence being limited to that day.

18, 19. Comparisons. "And the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun; and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound," v. 26. That this prediction is to be taken literally, is seen from the comparisons of the new light of the moon and sun to that of the sun ordinarily, and to its light raised to a sevenfold intensity; as it is a law of that figure, that the things compared are compared according to their real nature, and therefore are named literally. If it is not the light of the moon that is compared to that of the sun, and of the sun that is compared to its own light augmented to a sevenfold brilliance, what are the things that are compared? What are the subjects of the propositions? There are certainly no means of determining. The prediction indicates a change, therefore, it seems probable, that is to take place at the creation of the new heavens and new earth.

20, 21. Hypocatastases in the use of breach and wound, injuries that are proper only to individuals, as substitutes for the calamities and judgments with which the Israelites as a people were smitten. The period of the great change in the atmosphere which the prediction foreshows, is to be that of God's interposition to bind up the breach of the nation, and heal their wound. It is to be at the epoch therefore of Christ's second coming, when they are to be redeemed from their enemies, and restored to their land, and the earth and air are to be renovated, and made fit for the residence of the risen saints, and the regenerated nations. The prophet proceeds accordingly to depict the mode of his interposition.

22, 23, 24. Metaphors, in the use of burning, heavy, and full. "Behold the name of Jehovah cometh from afar, burning his anger, and heavy the flame: his lips are full of wrath," v. 27. His anger is said to burn to indicate its vehemence, and the flame to be heavy, to express its insup-

portableness, or the vastness of its manifestations. His lips are said to be full of wrath, to denote that he is to breathe out overwhelming expressions of his anger, or a devouring fire, like that with which he is to consume the man of sin" (2 Thess. ii. 8). This is indicated in the next expression.

25. Comparison, of his tongue to fire. "And his tongue as a devouring fire," v. 27. This description clearly bespeaks a visible manifestation of himself. His coming from afar, is his descent in the clouds of heaven; the flaming fire which flashes from his presence, is the fire of his vengeance, with which he is to consume his enemies; and his tongue is to pronounce a sentence that will be to them like a devouring flame. This comparison, indeed, makes it certain that he is to be visibly present; as it is the law of that figure, that the things compared are those which the names by which they are designated, literally denote. His tongue is literally, therefore, to be as a devouring fire in the sentences of wrath it will pronounce; and thence he is to be visibly present.

26. Comparison. "And his breath, like an overflowing stream, shall divide as far as the neck," v. 28. That the breath of Jehovah is to divide at the neck, like an overflowing stream that rises to that point, leaving only the head out of the water, implies that it is to threaten all who are immersed in it with destruction. The comparison here again shows that the fiery breath of Jehovah is literally to be effused on his enemies; and therefore that he is to be literally present.

27, 28. Hypocatastases: "To sift the nations in the sieve of perdition, and there shall be a bridle in the jaws of the people to mislead them," v. 28. To sift the nations with a sieve of perdition, that is, a sieve that consigns them to perdition, by showing that they are all chaff, is used by substitution for a judicial process which shall show them to be God's enemies, and sentence them to destruction. In like manner a bridle in the jaws of the people that misleads them, is put for some analogous instrument, or means of influence, such as false doctrines, or the authority of apostate teachers and rulers, that is to lead them into rebellion. The antichristian nations are at that period to be under the dominion of powerful and fatal delusions. The prophet now

contrasts their dreadful condition with the joyfulness that is to reign in the hearts of his people.

29, 30. Comparisons: "But a song shall be to you, like the night of the consecration of a feast, and joy of heart like one marching with a pipe to go into the mountain of Jehovah, to the Rock of Israel," v. 29. The Israelites are to have such a sense of their security from the presence of Jehovah to protect them, that they are to rejoice as at the festivals when the gates of the city were open to the access of whoever pleased; when acts of worship occupied the population, and gladness reigned, instead of fear.

31. Elliptical metaphor, in denominating Jehovah "the Rock of Israel,"—to indicate the impregnableness of the defence which he is to yield to his people.

"And Jehovah shall cause to be heard the majesty of his voice; and the descent of his arm shall he cause to be seen, with indignation of anger, and a flame of devouring fire, scattering, and rain, and hailstones," v. 30. This indicates, again, in the most emphatic manner, that God is to appear in person. The scene described is that of his descent in a flaming tempest, uttering his voice in majesty, hurling his avenging bolts against his enemies, and dashing on them a storm of rain and hail, as in his interposition to deliver David from the assassins whom Saul had set to destroy him. "Then did the earth shake and quake, and the foundations of the mountains trembled and were shaken, because he was angry. There went up smoke in his wrath, and fire from his mouth devours. Coals are kindled from it. And he bowed the heavens and came down, and gloom was under his feet. And he rode on a cherub and flew; he flew on the wings of the wind. He made darkness his covering; his tent about him dark waters, thick clouds. From the brightness before him his clouds passed, hailstones, and coals of fire. Then Jehovah thundered in the heaven, and the Highest gave his voice, hailstones and coals of fire. Then sent he his arrows and scattered them, and many lightnings and discomfited them. Then were seen the channels of waters, and the foundations of the earth discovered at thy rebuke, O Jehovah, at the blast of the breath of thy wrath. He extends his hand from above, he takes me, he draws me out of many waters. He delivers me from my strong

enemies and from my haters, because they are many. They surprised me in the day of my calamity; but Jehovah was my stay; and he brought me out into a large place."—Psaln xviii. 7–19. The epiphany predicted in the text, is thus in all its essential features like that here described. Jehovah utters a voice that bespeaks his deity; he stretches down his arm to hurl his bolts at his enemies; he breathes from his lips a devouring fire; he flashes on them his lightning shafts scattering them; and dashes on them a tempest of rain and hail.

32. Metonymy of Assyria, for its inhabitants. "For at the voice of Jehovah shall Assyria be broken; with the rod shall he smite" *them*.

33. Metaphor in the use of broken for destroyed. As to break a vessel, a rod, or a weapon, is to destroy it for the purpose for which it is formed, so the breaking of the Assyrians is to be an analogous dissolution and destruction of their hosts. By the Assyrians are meant doubtless the great enemies of the north, who are at the predicted period to have possession of Assyria, and pass from it to Palestine; and they are probably the Gog and Magog of Ezekiel, who are to coöperate with the armies of the wild beast at the great battle of Armageddon. That the Russian hosts, the vassals of the dragon, are to take part in that conflict, is seen from the fact that the unclean spirits who gather the kings of the earth to the battle of that great day, go forth out of the mouth of the dragon, as well as out of the mouth of the beast and out of the mouth of the false prophet. They may be mentioned in this passage, in distinction from the hosts generally whose destruction is foretold in the preceding verse, because they were alone known to the Hebrews of the prophet's age.

34. Hypocatastasis, in the use of smiting with a rod, as a substitute for the analogous mode in which God will destroy the Assyrians. Instead of a rod, God will dash them with his avenging lightnings.

35. Hypocatastasis. "And every place where the destined rod shall pass which the Lord shall lay on him, it shall be with tabrets and harps, and with tumultuous battles and fight with it," (v. 32.) Laying a rod on the Assyrian is a substitution for the analogous inflictions by which

he is to be destroyed. The tabrets and harps are to be used by the Israelites, doubtless, in chanting the victory of the Almighty over their foes.

36. Comparison. "For tophet is ordained of old; even for the king it is prepared. He hath made it deep; he hath made it large; its pile is fire and much fuel: the breath of Jehovah, like a stream of brimstone, kindles it," (v. 33.) Tophet, which was the name of a part of the valley of Hinnom, where fires were kept burning continually to consume the filth of the city, of which it was the depository, is here used as the name of a pit, like the crater of a volcano, into which the king of Assyria is to be precipitated alive, as the wild beast and false prophet are to be cast alive into the lake of fire and brimstone—the symbol of the place of their everlasting punishment. The similarity of their doom, which is threatened to none else, indicates that it is to take place at the same occasion. That it is still future, is certain from the fact that there has been no such visible advent of Jehovah to destroy his enemies and redeem his ancient people; and no king of Assyria has been cast alive into the place of the second death.

The period to which the prophecy, v. 18-23, refers, is undoubtedly therefore that of Christ's second advent, destruction of his armed enemies, and reëstablishment of the Israelites in peace and prosperity in their ancient land.

#### CHAPTER XXXI.

The theme of this chapter is the same as of the preceding. A war is denounced against those who went down to Egypt for help. Jehovah announces his purpose to interpose and fight for Mount Zion. The Israelites are therefore exhorted to return to him, and forewarned that when he comes to redeem them, they will cast away their idols: and the Assyrian will be destroyed, not by a mortal, but by the divine hand.

1, 2. Hypocatastases. "Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help; and stay on horses, and trust in chariots, because they are many; and in horsemen, because they are very strong: but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord," (v. 1.) To stay on horses,



which literally denotes to stop or remain on them, is put for relying on them in war. To look unto the Holy One of Israel, which is an act of the visual organ, is put for the analogous act of directing the mind to him in supplication and trust. Their going to Egypt for help was a formal abandonment of Jehovah as their God, and rejection of the aid which he promised them against their foes. His perfections, therefore, required that he should confound their schemes of protecting themselves independently of him. To have allowed them to succeed in their alliance with the Egyptians, would have been to let events take such a shape as should seem to justify them in preferring the alliance of the Egyptians to his favor. They would naturally have said: The Gods of the Egyptians are stronger than Jehovah, for they have given us a victory. They are therefore better entitled than he to our homage.

3, 4. Hypocatastases: "Yet he too is wise, and brings evil; and his words he removes not, and he rises up against the house of evil-doers, and against the help of them that work iniquity," v. 2. God, however, is infinitely wise, and knows how to vindicate his rights. He is not to be defrauded of his prerogatives by their desertion of him, nor baffled in his counsels; but he will vindicate his truth by the evils with which he will punish their rebellion. Not removing his words, which would be not to change them from one place to another, is put for his not recalling or rescinding them; and rising against the house of the evil-doers, which is assuming an attitude against them, is put for exercising providential acts, by which they were to be confounded and punished.

5. Metonymy of house, for family, of evil-doers.

6. Hypocatastasis: "And Egypt is man and not God, and their horses flesh and not spirit: and Jehovah shall stretch out his hand, and the helper shall stumble, and the helped fall, and together all of them shall cease," v. 3. God was to show the infinite difference between himself and the Egyptians and their horses. They were to be seen in their true nature, as men, and as animals, so frail, so helpless, and so completely under God's control, that he needed only to stretch out his hand, and both the Egyptians and the Israelites who had gone to them for safety, would vanish from

existence. Stretching out his hand, as to strike, which is a corporeal act, is put for acts of his providence that were directed against them.

7. Metonymy of Egypt for the Egyptians, who inhabited it.

8. Comparison: "For thus said Jehovah unto me: As a lion growls, and a young lion over his prey, against whom a multitude of shepherds is called forth; at their voice he is not frightened, and at their noise he is not humbled; so will Jehovah of Hosts come down to fight upon Mount Zion and upon her hill," v. 4. A lion in possession of his prey, is not driven from it nor moved in the least with alarm by a crowd of shepherds, who rely on nothing but noise to frighten him; he only growls to show that he is aware of their presence, and is ready to turn on them, if they assail him; so Jehovah is not to be driven by his enemies to relinquish Mount Zion; instead, he will come down at length in visible majesty to fight for it against the hosts that are assembled to besiege it, and will rescue it from their grasp.

9. Comparison: "As birds flying, so will Jehovah cover over Jerusalem, cover and rescue, pass over and save," v. 5. The flying of birds, which is the subject of the comparison, is their flying around and over their nests to cover and protect them from assailants;—a beautiful image of tenderness and skill. So Jehovah will cover Jerusalem, pass over, and save it. That it is the literal Jerusalem that he is thus to cover and save, is seen from the law of the comparison, that the names of the things compared are always used in their literal sense. The covering with which Jerusalem is to be overshadowed, is that doubtless of the cloud of the divine presence which is to hover over the city. "And Jehovah will create over the whole extent of Mount Zion, and over her whole assemblies, a cloud by day, and smoke and the brightness of a flaming fire by night; for over all the glory shall be a covering," chap. iv. 5. And this shows that the period when God is thus to come down to cover, rescue, and save Jerusalem, is that of Christ's second advent; as there is to be no such visible manifestation of the divine presence and glory till then.

10. Apostrophe: "Return unto him from whom the

children of Israel have revolted; for in that day they shall cast away every man his idols of silver and his idols of gold, which your hands have made for you a sin," vs. 6, 7. The displays Jehovah will then make of his presence and glory, will annihilate all doubt that he alone is God, and put an end to the homage to idols, which have neither intelligence nor life. And that is one of the great effects which his visible advent will accomplish. There is not a hint in the Bible that men will ever renounce idolatry, till Christ comes and asserts and demonstrates his exclusive deity, by revealing himself in his glory, and visibly assuming the sceptre of the earth.

11. Metonymy of Assyria for the king of Assyria. "And Assyria shall fall by no man's sword. And no mortal's sword shall devour him; and he shall flee from before the sword, and his young men shall melt," v. 8. This indicates that he is to be destroyed, as is foreshown in the preceding chapter, vs. 31-33, by the direct hand of the Almighty.

12. Metaphor in the use of melt, to signify that the young men of the king of Assyria will be overcome and divested of all their strength by the terrors of that day.

13. Elliptical metaphor in denominating the strongest part of his forces his rock. "And his rock from fear shall pass away, and his chiefs shall be afraid of a standard, saith Jehovah, to whom there is a fire in Zion, and a furnace in Jerusalem," v. 9. This also implies that the visible presence of the Almighty is to be the cause of their fear. The standard of which they are to be afraid, is to be that of the great Redeemer, whose kingdom they come to overthrow, but whose fire is then to burn on Mount Zion, and whose furnace is to glow in Jerusalem.

This prophecy thus, like that of the preceding chapter, foreshows that the period when God is to interpose to redeem his ancient people, and make Jerusalem again the scene of his visible presence, is that of Christ's second coming, and the destruction of the hostile hosts who are then to be assembled in Palestine, to prevent the establishment of his millennial kingdom.

## ART. VII.—THE LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL.

THE LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL, by the Rev. W. J. Conybeare, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; and the Rev. J. S. Howson, M.A., Principal of the Collegiate Institution, Liverpool. In two volumes. Third Edition. New York: Charles Scribner, 1855.

ONE of the most striking displays which God makes of his sovereignty in the government of the world, is in determining the spheres in which individuals are called to act, and the nature and degrees of the influence it is their lot to exert. Their talents, their apparent opportunities, and their purposes and efforts even, often have but a very slight agency, compared with other causes, in conducting them to the places they occupy, and settling the kinds and measures of the effects they produce. Those endowed with eminent powers, and enjoying seemingly, from their descent, education, or connexions, the greatest advantages of position, often pass away without leaving a trace of their existence in the world; while others, emerging from obscurity, and with no eminent external advantages or personal gifts to attract attention, and invest them with power over their fellow-men, rise, by the appointment of Divine Providence, to spheres of vast influence, and give by their agency a color to the principles and history of crowds of the human family, through a long series of generations. This is strikingly exemplified in the life of the apostle Paul. Had it been left to the men of his age to judge beforehand who would probably be selected by the Most High to proclaim to the nations the glad tidings of redemption through Christ, plant churches in the great cities of Western Asia and Europe, give them inspired instructions for their guidance in doctrine and life, and exert a commanding influence by his labors, example, and writings, on the long series of subsequent generations, they doubtless would have assigned the office to some distinguished person of the Jewish priesthood, who was already a minister of Jehovah; to one of the eminent expositors of the Hebrew law, or rulers of that people; or, perhaps, to some one of the renowned philosophers, orators, or poets, of Greece or Rome, whose genius and reputation would give him authority with his countrymen. Not one of those,

however, so far as we are aware, was called to take any conspicuous part in the great work of making known the good news of salvation to the nations. They were left to be mere spectators, or acted only in so humble a sphere, that their names have not descended to their successors. The heralds of the kingdom universally were taken from other classes, and he who in distinction from all others was constituted the apostle of the Gentiles, and bore the gospel to Northern Syria, the vast region that lies westward between the Mediterranean and the Euxine, and finally to Rome, the metropolis of the world, was taken from a city remote from Palestine, without any advantages of rank, family, or person, and from among the rejectors and persecutors of the faith, instead of its disciples; and a power lodged in his hands, a scene of labor assigned him, and a train of results made to spring from his ministry, such in beneficence, greatness, and moral grandeur, as have never marked the history of any other human individual.

His life and labors, accordingly, form one of the finest themes that can engage the study of a historian of the first age of the church, and expositor of the measures by which it was planted in the great cities of Asia, Greece, and Italy; unfolding the loftiest displays of a sanctified mind of superior strength and ardor, and the greatest gentleness, tenderness, patience, and humility; detailing the most extraordinary labors, self-denials, sufferings, and successes in the work, and presenting the most comprehensive and impressive picture that was ever drawn by a human pencil, both of the renewed and sanctified heart, and of the heart in its alienation from God, and vassalage to error and sin.

And the subject is treated in the work under notice—though not with the highest genius or eminent spiritual knowledge—with great learning and good judgment. The authors have investigated the whole range of themes that belong to the subject with great care; they avoid extreme opinions, and give the results of their inquiries with clearness and candor; and the geographical and historical parts of their work present a vast amount of interesting and important information, illustrated very amply with maps, land-sketches of cities and buildings, coins, and other monuments of the early Christian ages.

They introduce the work with a view of the religious and moral condition of the three principal nations to whom the gospel was first proclaimed, the Jews, the Greeks, and the Romans; and the preparation that had taken place from the decay of the systems of paganism for the introduction of a new religion. They then trace the history of Paul from his birth at Tarsus, to his conversion: and from his conversion through the long series of his journeys, voyages, labors, sufferings, and triumphs, till his death: weaving into the narrative all the incidents that are related in the Acts and his Epistles, giving a minute and graphic description of the several countries and cities which he visited, and presenting a new translation of his letters, with copious exegetical and illustrative notes. The following is their description of a voyage in that age from Seleucia in Syria, to Salamis in Cyprus; from Paphos, in that island, to Perga in Pamphylia, the route of Paul's first missionary voyage; and a journey thence over the mountains to Antioch in Pisidia.

"We may well suppose that he might sail from Seleucia to Salamis at the beginning of spring. In that age, and in those waters, the commencement of a voyage was usually determined by the advance of the season. The sea was technically said to be open in the month of March. If St. Paul began his journey in that month, the lapse of two months might easily bring him to Perga, and allow sufficient time for all that we are told of his proceedings at Salamis and Paphos. If we suppose him to have been at Perga in May, this would have been exactly the most natural time for a journey to the mountains. Earlier in the spring the passes would have been filled with snow. In the heat of summer the weather would have been less favorable for the journey. In the autumn the disadvantages would have been still greater, from the approaching difficulties of winter. But again, if St. Paul was at Perga in May, a further reason may be given why he did not stay there, but seized all the advantages of the season for prosecuting his journey to the interior. The habits of a people are always determined or modified by the physical peculiarities of their country; and a custom prevails among the inhabitants of this part of Asia Minor, which there is every reason to believe has been unbroken for centuries. At the beginning of the hot season they move up from the plains to the oval basin-like hollows on the mountains. These *yailahs*, or summer retreats, are always spoken of with pride and satisfaction, and the time of the

journey anticipated with eager delight. When the time arrives, the people may be seen ascending to the upper grounds ; men, women, and children, with flocks and herds, camels and asses, like the patriarchs of old. If, then, St. Paul was at Perga in May, he would find the inhabitants deserting its hot and silent streets. They would be moving in the direction of his own intended journey. He would be under no temptation to stay. And if we imagine him as joining some such company of Pamphylian families on his way to the Pisidian mountains, it gives much interest and animation to the thought of this part of his progress.

“ Perhaps it was in such company that the apostle entered the first passes of the mountainous district along some road formed partly by artificial pavement, and partly by the native marble, with high cliffs frowning on either hand, with tombs and inscriptions, even then ancient, on the projecting rocks around, and with copious fountains bursting out among thickets of pomegranates and oleanders. The oleander, ‘ the favorite flower of the Levantine midsummer,’ abounds in the lower water courses, and in the month of May it borders all the banks with a line of brilliant crimson. As the path ascends, the rocks begin to assume the wilder grandeur of mountains, the richer fruit trees begin to disappear, and the pine and walnut succeed, though the plane-tree still stretches its wide leaves over the stream which dashes wildly down the ravine, crossing and recrossing the dangerous road. The alteration of climate which attends on the traveller’s progress, is soon perceptible. A few hours will make the difference of weeks, or even months. When the corn is in the ear on the lowlands, ploughing and sowing are hardly well begun on the highlands. Spring flowers may be seen in the mountains by the very edge of the snow ; when the anemone is withered in the plain, and the pink veins of the white asphodel flower are shrivelled in the heat. When the cottages are closed, and the grass is parched, and everything is silent below in the purple haze and stillness of midsummer, clouds are seen drifting among the Pisidian precipices, and the cavern is often a welcome shelter from a cold and penetrating wind. The upper part of this district is a wild region of cliffs, often isolated and bare, and separated from each other by valleys of sand, which the storm drives with blinding violence among the shivered points. The trees become fewer and smaller at every step. Three belts of vegetation are successively passed through in ascending from the coast, first the oakwoods, then the forests of pine, and, lastly the dark scattered patches of the cedar-juniper ; and then we reached the treeless plains of the interior, which stretch in dreary extension to the north and to the east.

“ After such a journey as this, separating, we know not where,

from the companions whom they may have joined, and often thinking of that Christian companion who had withdrawn himself from their society when they needed him most. Paul and Barnabas emerged from the rugged mountain passes, and came upon the central table-land of Asia Minor. The whole interior region of the Peninsula may be correctly described by this term; for, though intersected in various directions by mountain ranges, it is on the whole a vast plateau, elevated higher than the summit of Ben-Nevis above the level of the sea. This is its general character, though a long journey across the district brings the traveller through many varieties of scenery. Sometimes he moves for hours along the dreary margin of an inland sea of salt; sometimes he rests in a cheerful, hospitable town by the shore of a fresh-water lake. In some places the ground is burnt and volcanic, in others green and fruitful. Sometimes it is depressed into watery hollows, where wild swans visit the pools, and storks are seen fishing and feeding among the weeds; more frequently it is spread out into the broad open downs, like Salisbury Plain, which afford an interminable pasture for flocks of sheep. To the north of Pamphylia, the elevated plain stretches through Phrygia for a hundred miles, from Mount Olympus to Mount Taurus. The southern portion of these bleak uplands was crossed by St. Paul's track, immediately before his arrival at Antioch in Pisidia."—Vol. i. pp. 164–168.

The following is a description of the scene through which he passed on his second journey into Asia Minor, across Mount Taurus:—

"The vast mountain barrier which separates the sunny plains of Cilicia and Pamphylia from the central table-land, has frequently been mentioned. On the former journey, St. Paul travelled from the Pamphylian plain to Antioch in Pisidia, and thence by Iconium to Lystra and Derbe. His present course across the mountains was more to the eastward; and the last-mentioned cities were visited first. More passes than one lead down from Lycaonia and Cappadocia through the chain of Taurus into Cilicia. And it has been supposed that the apostle travelled through one of the minor passes, which quits the lower plain, to Pompeiopolis, and enters the upland plain of Iconium, not far from the conjectural site of Derbe. But there is no sufficient reason to suppose that he went by any other than the ordinary road. A traveller wishing to reach the Valais conveniently from the banks of the Lago Maggiore, would rather go by the Simplon, than by the difficult path across the Monte Moro; and there is one great pass in Asia Minor which may be call-





ed the Simplon of Mount Taurus, described as a rent or fissure in the mountain chain, extending from north to south through a distance of eighty miles, and known in ancient days by the name of the 'Cilician Gates,'—which has been in all ages the easiest and most convenient entrance from the northern and central parts of the peninsula to the level by the sea shore, where the traveller pauses before he enters Lycia. The securing this pass was the greatest cause of anxiety to Cyrus, when he marched into Babylonia to dethrone his brother. Through this gorge Alexander descended to that Cilician plain which has been finely described by a Greek historian, as a theatre made by nature's hand for the drama of great battles. Cicero followed in the steps of Alexander, as he tells his friend Atticus, in a letter written with characteristic vanity. And to turn to the centuries which have elapsed since the time of the apostles and the first Roman emperors, twice at least this pass has been the pivot on which the struggle for the throne of the East seemed to turn—once in the war described by obscure historians, when a pretender at Antioch made the Taurus his defence against the Emperor of Rome; and once in a war which we remember, when a pretender at Alexandria fortified it, and advanced beyond it in his attempt to dethrone the Sultan. In the wars between the Crescent and the Cross, which have filled up so much of the intervening period, this defile has decided the fate of many an army. The Greek historians of the first Saracen invasions describe it by a word unknown to classical Greek, which denotes, that when this passage (between Cappadocia and Cilicia) was secure, the frontier was closed. The Crusaders, shrinking from the remembrance of its precipices and dangers, called it by the more awful name of the Gates of Judas.

"Through this pass we conceive St. Paul to have travelled on his way from Cilicia to Lycaonia. And if we say that the journey was made in the spring of the year 51, we shall not deviate very far from the actual date. By those who have never followed the apostle's footsteps, the successive features of the scenery through which he passed may be compiled from the accounts of recent travellers, and arranged in the following order. After leaving Tarsus, the road ascends the valley of the Cydnus, which, for some distance, is nothing more than an ordinary mountain valley, with wooded eminences and tributary streams. Beyond the point where the road from Adanah comes in from the right, the hills suddenly draw together and form a narrow pass, which has always been guarded by precipitous cliffs, and is now crowned by the ruins of a medieval castle. In some places the ravine contracts to a width of ten or twelve paces, leaving room for only one chariot to pass. It is an anxious place to any one in command of a military expedition. To one who is

unburdened by such responsibility, the scene around is striking and impressive. A canopy of fir trees is high overhead. Bare limestone cliffs rise above on either hand to an elevation of many hundred feet. The streams which descend towards the Cydnus are closed by the road, and here and there undermine it, or wash over it. When the higher and more distant of these streams are left behind, the road emerges upon an open and elevated region, 4000 feet above the level of the sea. This space of high land may be considered as dividing the whole mountain journey into two parts. For when it is passed, the streams are seen to flow in a new direction. Not that we have attained the point where the highest land of Asia Minor turns the waters north and south. The torrents which are seen descending to the right are merely the tributaries of the Sarus, another river of Cilicia. The road is conducted northwards through this new ravine, and again the rocks close in upon it, with steep naked cliffs, among cedars and pines, forming an intricate defile which a handful of men might convert into another Thermopylæ. When the highest peaks of Taurus are left behind, the road to Tyana is continued in the same northerly direction; while that to Iconium takes a turn to the left, and passes among wooded slopes with rocky projections, and over ground comparatively level, to the great Lycaonian plain."—Vol. i. pp. 257–261.

Of Thessalonica they give the following account:—

"The apostolic city at which we are now arrived, was known in the early periods of its history under various names. Under that of Therma, it is associated with some interesting recollections. It was the resting-place of Xerxes on his march; it is not unmentioned in the Peloponnesian war; and it was a frequent subject of debate in the last independent assemblies of Athens. When the Macedonian power began to overshadow all the countries where Greek was spoken, this city received its new name, and began a new and more distinguished period of its history. A sister of Alexander the Great was called Thessalonica, and her name was given to the city of Therma when rebuilt and embellished by her husband, Cassander, the son of Antipater. This name, under a form slightly modified, has continued to the present day. The Salnech of the early German poets has become the Saloniki of the modern Levant. Its history can be followed as continuously as its name. When Macedonia was partitioned into four provincial divisions by Paulus Æmilius, Thessalonica was the capital of that which lay between the Axios and the Strymon. When the four regions were united into one Roman province, this city was chosen as the metropolis of the whole. Its name appears

more than once in the annals of the civil wars. It was the scene of the exile of Cicero; and one of the stages of his journey between Rome and his province in the East. Anthony and Octavius were here after the battle of Philippi; and coins are still extant which allude to the freedom granted by the victorious leaders to the city of the Thermaic gulf. Strabo, in the first century, speaks of Thessalonica as the most populous town of Macedonia. Lucian, in the second century, uses similar language. Before the founding of Constantinople it was virtually the capital of Greece and Illyricum, as well as of Macedonia, and shared the trade of the *Ægean* with Ephesus and Corinth. Even after the eastern Rome was built and reigned over the Levant, we find both Pagan and Christian writers speaking of Thessalonica as the metropolis of Macedonia, and a place of great magnitude. Through the middle ages it never ceased to be important; and it is at the present day the second city in European Turkey. The reason of this continued preeminence is to be found in its geographical position. Situated on the inner bend of the Thermaic gulf, halfway between the Adriatic and the Hellespont, on the sea-margin of a vast plain watered by several rivers; and at the entrance of the pass which commands the approach to the other great Macedonian level, it was evidently destined for a mercantile emporium. . . . There probably never was a time from the day when it first received its name, that this city, as viewed from the sea, has not had the aspect of a busy, commercial town. We see at once how appropriate a place it was for one of the starting points of the gospel in Europe; and we can appreciate the force of the expression used by St. Paul within a few months of his departure from the Thessalonians, when he says, that from them the word of the Lord had sounded forth like a trumpet, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but in every place.'

"No city which we have had occasion to describe, has had so distinguished a Christian history, with the single exception of the Syrian Antioch; and the Christian glory of the patriarchal city gradually faded before that of the Macedonian metropolis. The heroic age of Thessalonica was the third century. It was the bulwark of Constantinople in the shock of the barbarians; and it held up the torch of the truth to successive tribes who overspread the country between the Danube and the *Ægean*,—the Goths and the Slaves, the Bulgarians of the Greek church, and the Wallachians, whose language still seems to connect them with Philippi, and the Roman colonies."—Vol. i. pp. 322–324.

Of the apostle's teachings to the Thessalonians respecting

the coming and kingdom of Christ, they present the following view.

"That St. Paul did speak of Messiah's glorious kingdom, the kingdom foretold in the prophetic Scriptures themselves, may be gathered by comparing the Acts and the Epistles to the Thessalonians. The accusation brought against him (Acts xvii. 7), was that he was proclaiming another *king*, and virtually rebelling against the emperor. And in strict conformity with this, the Thessalonians are reminded of the exhortations and entreaties he gave them when among them, that they would walk worthily of the God who had called them to his *kingdom* and glory (1 Thess. ii. 12), and addressed as those who had suffered affliction for the sake of that kingdom (2 Thess. i. 5). Indeed, *the royal state of Christ's second advent was one chief topic which was urgently enforced, and deeply impressed on the minds of the Thessalonian converts. This subject tinges the whole atmosphere through which the aspect of this church is presented to us.* It may be said that in each of the primitive churches, which are depicted in the apostolic epistles, there is some peculiar feature which gives it an individual character. In Corinth, it is the spirit of party; in Galatia, the rapid declension into Judaism; in Philippi, it is a steady and self-denying generosity. And if we were asked for the distinguishing characteristic of the first Christians of Thessalonica, we should point to their overwhelming sense of the nearness of the second advent, accompanied with melancholy thoughts concerning those who might die before it, and with gloomy and unpractical views of the shortness of life and vanity of the world. Each chapter in the first Epistle to the Thessalonians ends with an allusion to this subject; and it was evidently the topic of frequent conversations when the apostle was in Macedonia.\* But St. Paul never spoke or wrote of the future as though the present was to be forgotten. When the Thessalonians were admonished of Christ's advent, he told them also of other coming events, full of practical warning to all ages, though to our eyes they are still shrouded in mystery—of 'the falling away' and of 'the Man of sin.' These awful revelations, he said, must precede the revelation of the Son of God, 'Do you not remember,' he adds, with emphasis in his letter, 'that when I was still with you I often told you of this?' You know, therefore, the hindrance why he is not revealed, as he will be in his own season.

---

\* The authors misapprehend the error into which the Thessalonians had been betrayed. The announcement of the false teachers which Paul contradicts was, it is plain from his language, that Christ's second advent *was* had already taken place, not that it was near.

He told them in the words of Christ himself that the times and the seasons of the coming revelation were known only to God, and he warned them, as the first disciples had been warned in Judea, that the great day would come suddenly on men unprepared, as a thief in the night, and he showed them that though life is short and the world is vanity, yet God's work must be done diligently and to the last."—Vol. i. pp. 327, 328.

These passages indicate the style in which the several topics of the work are treated. The translations of the Epistles, instead of adhering rigidly to the terms and idioms of the original, are free and designed simply to give the reader the apostle's sense, rather than the exact form of his expressions. The work is, on the whole, a more valuable contribution to the literature of the New Testament, than any other that has proceeded from the British press for a long period, and deserves to be in the hands of every student of the sacred word.

Great, however, and impressive as the delineation is, which the work presents, of the labors of the apostle of the Gentiles, and the effects that sprang from his agency, that is not the most interesting relation in which it may be contemplated. It is invested with a still higher significance, considered as a picture of the reception which Christianity met from the most intelligent and cultivated nations at its institution, and as a portraiture therefore of the heart of man on the one hand, and on the other an exponent in a measure, of the peculiar ends which God is pursuing in his present administration over the world. Why had such a series of dispensations been exercised over men in the antecedent ages? Why had the great nations been left to fabricate such false systems of religion, sink to such depths of moral debasement, and employ themselves, on such a vast scale, in the merciless oppression and slaughter of each other? Why, when the glad tidings of salvation through Christ were proclaimed to the nations, were the means and agencies by which they were enforced, restricted within such limits, and men left to reject, oppose, and obstruct them in such a manner? What are the great ends that are to be achieved by the displays that take place under this system of administration of God's sovereignty on the one side, and of man's alienation and perverseness on the other, that, to the wisdom of God,

render it preferable to any other? What is the great principle on which he is proceeding? What are the great truths that have been demonstrated, and are still demonstrating in the most conspicuous and effective manner through this long series of ages? And how is it that they can contribute to prepare the way for the far different system of government which is to follow the present, at the second coming of Christ, and the establishment of his throne on the earth? These are questions that are very naturally presented by the impressive picture these volumes give of the instruments by which the gospel was first made known to the great cities of Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, Macedonia, and Italy, the violent and cruel opposition it met from Jews and Pagans, and the perversions to which it was immediately subjected by a large share of those who professedly embraced it. They may be considered, indeed, as substantially presented by Paul himself, in his address to the Athenians on Mars hill, in his declaration that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation, *that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him*, though he be not far from every one of us; as in him we live, and move, and have our being, and we are his offspring; that therefore as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that he is like unto gold, or silver, or stone graven by art or man's device; yet the times of this ignorance God allowed to pass." That is, that God through the ages that had then revolved, had made by his providence a trial whether or not the nations would discern him by the light of nature, and honor him according to his perfections and rights; and that on their apostatizing to idols, he had left them to pursue their false systems and work out their natural results. But that now having invested the Messiah with the sceptre of the world, and appointed a day in which he shall judge the nations, *he commands all men everywhere to repent*. That is, in other words, he was now to make an experiment whether under the administration of a Mediator, a system of revealed laws, and a method of redemption by grace from the dominion and curse of sin, men would repent of their apostasy and become obedient.

In conducting these great experiments, it is apparent that the wisdom and righteousness of God required that he should, in a large degree, conform his providence towards men to their conduct towards him: if they apostatized from him and gave their homage to false deities, he could not, consistently, connect with their rebellious agency, the peculiar blessings which he had promised to bestow as the rewards of obedience. That were to confound evil with good, revolt with allegiance. His justice and holiness made it essential that he should withhold from them many of his gifts, and punish them with wants, calamities, and sorrows; and if they rejected his holy laws and adopted false and profligate rules of conduct, he could not consistently connect with their wicked acts, the safety, peace, and happiness, which are the natural attendants of virtue. He was obliged to vindicate the truth and wisdom of his statutes, by leaving the violators of them to the dominion of the evil passions which they justified and nourished, and to the natural consequences of the indulgence of those passions, in the loss of their happiness, and the destruction of that of others. In short, his vindication of himself, and maintenance of his rights, required that he should allow their principles and passions to work out their natural results, and show their malignant character, by the immeasurable wickedness and misery to which they give birth.

This great principle of the divine administration is fully indicated in the Epistle to the Romans; in the announcement that the Most High having made his eternal power and godhead discernible through the things which he has created, so that men are without excuse for not recognising and honoring him as the Creator of all; he then, when though they knew him, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things; gave them up to the lusts of their own hearts—having changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever; and abandoned them to the unrestrained domination of every vile sensual affection, and every perversion and debasement of their



bodies: and then, finally, in consequence of that, left them to all the other selfish, malignant, and cruel passions and affections of which their nature is capable—unrighteousness, wickedness, envy, murder, contention, deceit, malignity, calumny, hate, pride, vanity, implacableness, unmercifulness, and the loss of all natural affection. As they apostatized from him, he thus withdrew from them: and as they deified their own nature, he left them to its dominion, and allowed them to sink to the lowest debasement as individuals, and to become the most malignant and merciless scourges to one another in their social relations; wreaking on each other every mean and ferocious passion; and thus showing, on a vast scale, what the true character of their hearts is, and what the condition of sin and misery is into which creatures naturally sink who apostatize from God. The great features, accordingly, of the minds of men that have been displayed under this experiment; the dispositions and tendencies which they have universally exhibited; are, first, to reject God as their creator, lawgiver, and benefactor, and substitute fictitious deities formed after their own hearts in his place; next, to plunge into the lowest perversion and degradation of their sensual nature; and lastly, to become ferocious and remorseless enemies of each other, and seek to find happiness and honor in inflicting on one another the most cruel and bloody outrages.

Thus, we are told; that in the ages that immediately followed the fall, "the wickedness of man became great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually; that God looked upon the earth and behold it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth, and the earth was filled with violence." (Genesis vi. 5, 11, 12.) Whether the evil imaginations of the thoughts of their hearts embraced the invention and worship of false gods, we are not expressly told; but the deep corruption of their manners, and the violence with which they filled the world, which are the usual consequences of a rejection of God, render it probable. The whole race advanced to such a pitch of wickedness, that divine justice required that they should be swept to destruction by a deluge. This universal apostasy from God, this excess of individual and social corruption and malevolence,

formed a terrible exhibition of what the human heart is, in its estrangement from the Most High. They were not left in the ignorance of the Pagan nations of the present age. They did not derive their false system of religion and morals from a long line of ancestors. Their wickedness was not instilled into them by ignorant parents, or an established priesthood, and enforced by a powerful civil government, under the deceitful garb of a divine religion. It was all originated and matured by themselves, and amidst the clear light of a divine revelation, and the powerful restraints of a knowledge of its guilt, solemn warnings from heaven, and the pious remonstrances and holy examples of patriarchs and prophets. God revealed himself openly to men in those ages, as we learn from his appearances to Adam, Cain, Enoch, and Noah, and announced his will to them in an audible voice. They were made acquainted with the scheme of redemption, and required to offer sacrifices in expression of their faith in the Messiah whom the slaughtered victims typified. They enjoyed the presence, counsels, and examples of Adam, through more than half of the period to the flood; and the instructions, probably, of a great array of eminent prophets down to their last years. Noah himself filled the office of a preacher of righteousness for at least a hundred and twenty years before he entered the ark. Yet, amidst all these eminent advantages; against all these powerful restraints, they sank universally, it seems—with the exception of Noah and his family—to such an abyss of corruption; they became inflamed, through all their grades, with such vile and malignant passions, as to render the divine forbearance any longer towards them inexpedient; as to make it essential to the vindication of God's rights and glory, that he should storm on them his vengeance, and sweep them instantaneously to perdition. What an amazing proof of their alienation! What an emphatic and terrible demonstration, that they were in open and unmitigated revolt! How clear must it have been to the witnessing universe, that they were indeed such enemies as the law of God and the work of redemption contemplate them; and that the doom with which they were overwhelmed was their just due!

Equal proofs were given by the descendants of Noah

within a brief period, of their alienation and debasement. Ere that patriarch died—three hundred and fifty years after the deluge,—every nation and tribe into which the race had become divided, had apostatized, there is reason to believe, to idol-worship. There were individuals and families, indeed, as Abram, Melchisedek, Job, and his friends, who retained the knowledge, and were worshippers of the true God, and they may have been numerous; yet no traces appear on the sacred page, that any whole people continued to be worshippers of Jehovah. The first uninspired histories also, and the earliest monuments of the ancient inhabitants of Egypt, Assyria, and India, exhibit them as idolaters. Not a trace appears in any of their religions, at the earliest date to which our information extends, of a recognition of the true God. This is certainly astonishing; as not only Noah lived till after that time, but Shem survived one hundred and fifty years longer, to the time of Jacob. So that very ample means must have been possessed of a knowledge of Jehovah, and the method of redemption he had made known to Adam, and renewed and confirmed to the holy patriarchs and prophets through all the long tract of ages that had intervened, to the division at Babel of the race into separate tribes. Whence can such a universal apostasy from Jehovah have sprung, except from an utter alienation of heart from him? How could they have turned from him to the besotted homage of creatures, idols, and mere imaginary deities, had there not been an absolute extinction in their minds of righteousness, truth, and wisdom; had they not yielded themselves to the unrestricted domination of the powers of darkness?

The principal ancient nations of central and western Asia, northern Africa, and eastern Europe, consisted of two classes: one that was under the domination of absolute monarchs and a legalized priesthood, who dictated to their subjects the religion they should exercise. The governments of the other sprang in a measure from the people themselves, and their religion was accordingly the creation and expression, in a large measure, of the popular sentiment and taste. As the rulers and priests of the despotic governments who dictated the religion of their subjects, were among the most talented and learned of their age, if they

had had any proper notions of Jehovah, and disposition to favor the exercise of a true religion, they might have exerted a powerful influence in repressing ignorance, superstition, and idol-worship, and prompting their subjects to a recognition of the true God. But no effort of that kind was ever made by them. Instead, the monarchs of Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, and India, and their priests, gave their whole influence to sustain and spread their several systems of idolatry. In Egypt, where the belief in the immortality of the soul, and the resurrection of the body, appears to have been retained, and to have given birth to their splendid Mausolea, and their custom of embalming the dead, their worship was transferred from Jehovah to the beasts, birds, and reptiles, that peopled the land, and the waters, and the air of that region; and among them not a few of the most hideous and senseless were made objects of special adoration. Their fanes were crowded also with idols and pictures of idol deities, and the whole population were forced by the iron hand of power to pay their homage to those horrid shapes, sometimes living, more frequently probably dead, and blackened and deformed by the efforts of the embalmer to give them a material immortality. Is it possible for creatures to offer a more awful affront to Jehovah their creator and upholder? Their paying this worship to the ox, the crocodile, the cat, the ibis, and the beetle, implied that their attributes were superior to his; that their stations, relations, and agencies, invested them with higher rights, and rendered them more worthy of acknowledgment and trust.

The despotic rulers of Assyria in like manner established a vast system of idolatry as the state religion, in which bulls and lions with human heads appear to have held the most conspicuous rank; while in Babylonia, Nebuchadnezzar erected a gigantic image of gold, of a human shape, as the object of homage, and required his subjects on penalty of death to worship it; and images, or material emblems of some form, were the objects of homage to the native inhabitants of Palestine, Syria, the adjacent parts of Asia Minor, and the vast regions that stretch eastward to the confines of India, for a long series of ages; while in India itself, a different set of still more hideous and monster shapes were constituted deities, and a vast array of priests employed to pay them a

worship of complicated and cruel rites. The despots who reigned over those populous and cultivated nations for two thousand years, instead of exerting their authority in repressing false religions, and prompting to the worship of Jehovah, gave their whole influence to the introduction and support of idolatry, forced their subjects to live as apostates from Jehovah, and made their cruel rites and debasing superstitions the means of reducing their people to the most abject vassalage to their power.

The Greeks of Asia Minor, the islands of the Mediterranean and eastern Europe, and the population of Italy, enjoyed a higher measure of freedom, and had a voice in the election of many of their rulers. Their governments were accordingly in a far larger degree the expression of the general will, and their religion the work of the popular sentiment. Their gods and religious rites were the gods and rites of the state, because the general voice made them so. Yet those nations, left thus to their own tastes in a far higher degree than those of the great eastern empires, still apostatized as universally and as eagerly as they to the homage of idols. The loftiest geniuses of Greece, and the Greek colonies of the islands and shores of the Mediterranean, were for ages devoted to the fabrication of marble and brazen deities, and the erection of temples for their residence. Their cities were thronged with gods not only in the temples, the halls of justice, the theatres, the stadia, and the markets, but in the streets, the gardens, and the houses, and their whole life was moulded and colored by their presence—thus showing in the most striking manner that no strength or subtlety of intellect, no refinement of taste, no literary culture, no measure of scientific knowledge, no perfection in the arts, no political freedom, nor any combination of them in their highest forms, is any barrier to an apostasy from Jehovah to idol-worship: that it is not ignorance and political degradation alone that prompt to it, but that the subtle, the learned, the witty, the refined in many forms, and the free, are borne as readily to the renunciation of the Creator and ruler of the universe, and the substitution of stocks and stones that are graven by man's art and device in his place, as the great nations of Asia and Africa whom the hand of despotism has kept in the

most abject ignorance and vassalage. A similar display was likewise made by the population of Italy.

And the whole of these nations continued their idolatry down to the age of the apostle. No experience of the vanity of their worship, none of the terrible judgments with which they were overwhelmed by the Most High in punishment of their revolt from him—judgments from which they learned that their gods could not deliver them—contributed in the slightest degree to excite them to abandon them. So far from it, they continued to multiply their deities and to sink to lower and lower depths of superstition and debasement in their worship, till their false systems began to be superseded by the gospel.

What an amazing exemplification of the human heart! Those nations comprised, with the exception of the Hebrews, the whole, or nearly the whole that had risen above extreme barbarism during the twenty-three centuries that followed the deluge, and abounded with rulers, philosophers, poets, and historians, of as great genius and as large cultivation in their several spheres as have ever appeared in the world! Yet with scarce an exception, their great powers were devoted to the sanction and spread of idolatry—the worship of marble, metallic, or wooden statues; the most hideous brutes and vilest reptiles; or human monsters of lust, treachery, cruelty, and ambition, deified by the imagination, and invested with a sway over the affairs of men. Can the fancy conceive of more decisive and dreadful proofs that the race is in open revolt from Jehovah, and rejects him and his service with the most intense aversion? If it be not, how is it that not a solitary dissentient from this monstrous impiety is heard through the lapse of so many ages; or at least not one except that it was at the risk of his life?

Their apostasy thus from Jehovah to the worship of false deities, in most of whom an animal and sexual nature was held to have a predominance, was necessarily followed, as the apostle indicates, by God's withdrawing from them, and giving them up to the unrestrained sway of the appetites which they impiously deified, and allowing them to sink to the lowest depths of impurity and debasement. The sexual passion, in its most unlicensed and polluting forms, was not  
v directly sanctioned, but its gratification was a part of

their homage to their deities ; their temples being made the scenes of public and boundless prostitution, and their priests and priestesses the chief actors in the horrid scenes. And from them the tide of lawlessness and corruption spread through all the inferior ranks, till the whole mass sank to the lowest abyss of pollution. The cities on the borders of the Asphaltine sea had reached such an extreme of wickedness in this relation, in the days of Abraham, that God swept them to destruction by a storm of fire and brimstone, and their site remains a monument at once of their guilt and his vengeance. Four hundred years later the Canaanites were destroyed, in a large measure, for their addiction to the same debasing sin. The Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the population of Syria preëminently, and of Asia Minor, were notorious for the profligacy of their manners ; and throughout the whole circuit of the Roman empire, in the age of the apostle, an almost total dissolution of morals had taken place.

And the unbridled reign of that debasing appetite gave birth also—as the spirit of truth indicates it naturally must—to the whole brood of selfish and malign passions, and converted its vassals into enemies, scourges, and destroyers of each other. The great business of the chief nations from the days of Abraham to the birth of Christ, was war, slaughter, conquest, plunder, devastation, and vengeance. During that period—besides the numerous wars between inferior kingdoms—five great empires rose, three in the east, and two in the west, that spread their conquests over a large part of the world that was then in any degree civilized, and steeped it in the blood of its inhabitants. The people were held to be the absolute property of the monarchs, and were crushed by an iron despotism ; millions on millions of the conquered were dragged into a hopeless and cruel slavery ; groans of misery and despair rose like a vast exhalation from every part of the earth ; and such things as safety, peace, gentleness, sympathy, love, benignity, were scarcely known to a human bosom.

Such was the career of the Pagan nations. The apostasy of the Israelites, the chosen people, from Jehovah to the idols of their heathen neighbors, the depths of impiety and profligacy to which they sank, and the fierce and bloody

wars in which, after their division into two kingdoms, they scourged and wasted each other, formed a still more awful exhibition of the human heart.

Such was the result of the trial of mankind through four thousand years, to see whether when God clearly revealed himself to them through his works, and made himself known to them in many other modes, they would recognise and honor him, or would reject and turn from him to the worship of imaginary deities; and to show with what direful passions they would become inflamed, and to what awful forms and degrees of wickedness they would turn, when he in righteousness abandons them, because of their apostasy, to the sway of their own corrupt and malignant hearts.

This is, indeed, but a faint picture compared to the dread reality. Yet slight and dim as it is, what a terrible proof it forms of man's alienation from God! But to the celestial hosts who witnessed the whole scene, and comprehended its fearful significance, how profound and overwhelming must the realization have been it produced, that the race are lost in a stern and remorseless enmity to Jehovah!

The exhibition made of the human heart under the gospel, in the opposition it met from Jews and Pagans at its promulgation, the dreadful perversion to which it was soon subjected, and the merciless persecution by which the true worshippers were for many ages pursued by Pagans and false Christians, is equally demonstrative of its utter alienation from God. The dark picture given in this work of the treatment Paul received as the great preacher of the glad tidings of salvation through Christ, may be taken as an exemplification of the reception the news of redemption met from the nations generally to whom it was first proclaimed. His life, through the twenty-six years of his labors, was one ceaseless conflict with passionate and malign opponents, a scene of perpetual peril from conspirators, assassins, mobs, and persecuting magistrates. He says of himself, "I am more a minister of Christ than others; in labors more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods; once was I stoned; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in



perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren, in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness." (2 Corin. xi. 23-27.) And he at length fell a victim to the malice of his enemies, and was decapitated at Rome. And this, simply because of his fidelity to Christ; notwithstanding his apostleship was demonstrated by a vaster crowd of stupendous miracles—especially in the bestowment of spiritual gifts in connexion with his agency,—than ever authenticated the mission of any other messenger of God; and although his conduct was marked by the greatest uprightness, prudence, gentleness, nobleness, self-denial, and zeal for the well-being of those whom he addressed. The hatred and malice with which he was pursued, and finally martyred, are only paralleled by the infuriate rage with which the Son of God was rejected amidst the clearest demonstrations of his deity, maligned, mocked, scourged, and at length put to death on the cross. Could such a procedure towards an upright, wise, holy and benevolent, noble-hearted, miracle-working preacher of salvation, have been possible, had not those who thus outraged him been the most stern and implacable foes of God, and lawless and brutal enemies of his children?

The persecution of the disciples of Christ begun by the Pagans in the apostle's life, was continued by them at intervals through more than two hundred and fifty years, and hundreds of thousands swept to the grave by the most ignominious and cruel deaths;—starved in dungeons, torn with hot irons, burnt at the stake, decapitated on the block, hung on the cross, thrown to wild beasts;—and all the power of the Roman empire was exerted to exterminate them from the earth. On the legalization and paganization of the church by Constantine, that monarch and a large portion of the hierarchy themselves became ferocious persecutors of the true worshippers, and his successors on the Byzantine throne continued to be such, with but short intervals, through more than a thousand years, till the extinction of that line by the Turks in 1453. The churches of Western Europe also apostatized at the same time as those of the East to the homage of saints, relics, and statues, converted

the established religion into a horrid system of the most impious errors and debasing superstitions, and became also cruel and insatiable persecutors; so that the Catholic churches themselves of the West and the East have been the greatest corruptors of the principles and morals of men the world has ever seen, the most impious blasphemers of God, and the most ferocious and remorseless oppressors and murderers of his children, through more than twelve hundred years; until in the East they have nearly sunk into extinction; while in the West they have almost universally passed from even the nominal belief in Christianity into the most black and impious atheism, and sunk, according to the usual law of God's providence, to the lowest depths of the most coarse and debasing immorality, and become inflamed with the most lawless and bloody passions. The comparatively small number of true worshippers who still exist, especially on the continent, exist by the special care of God, in spite of the most gigantic efforts of the Papal church and the civil powers through a long series of ages to exterminate them. The victims of their malice who have perished by the sword, on the rack, and at the stake, wasted away in loathsome dungeons, or been worn out at the galley oar, amount to millions. And these murderers of the lambs of Christ's flock have been as ferocious in their passions towards each other, as they have towards them. The nations of Western Europe have been almost incessantly engaged for the last twelve hundred years in the most bloody and malignant wars on each other. There is scarce an extensive region in their cultivated domains that has not been a battle-scene, and many of the vales and plains of Italy, Germany, France, and Spain, have frequently been drenched with the blood of thousands. No other part of even this fallen world, probably, has been the theatre of such direful ambition, hate, and revenge; or resounded with such a vast train of sighs and groans, extorted by the wanton infliction of wounds and death by man on man.

Such is, in brief, the result of the experiment God has made of the heart of man through eighteen hundred years under the gospel. Can a more stupendous and appalling demonstration be conceived that he is indeed such a fallen, revolting, and incorrigible being, as the word of God repre-

sents, and as the work of redemption assumes him to be that left to himself, he instantly apostatizes from God, and becomes a debased and ferocious brute; and that nothing but the infinite power and infinite grace of God can renew, transform, and save him?

Why now is it that God has chosen to exercise the dispensation under which those vast and direful demonstrations have taken place, on the one side, of the heart of man, and the condition to which he sinks when left without renewing grace; and on the other, of God's right to leave him if he please to act out his evil mind and perish under the just punishment of his sins? Is it not that these demonstrations, vast and carrying as they do the profoundest conviction of the truths which they set forth to the whole universe that witnesses them, are a necessary preparative for the gracious dispensation which is to succeed this, when instead of leaving men to the mere light of nature, or the present measure of revealed knowledge, the Redeemer is to come in visible majesty and reign on the earth, and all nations are to be converted, and the earth be made a paradise of righteousness and peace? Such is undoubtedly the fact, as we are expressly taught that this age in which the antichristian powers are in the supremacy, and false religions prevail, is to terminate at the second coming of Christ: that Satan is then to be imprisoned, and withheld from leading the nations to revolt; that all the great corruptors and oppressors of the church are to be swept from the earth; that the holy dead are to be raised from the grave and reign with Christ in the new created world; and that the Spirit of God is to be poured out in the most abundant and wondrous effusions, and all nations renewed and become obedient to the sceptre of the Redeemer. The present dispensation, accordingly, will then terminate unquestionably because all the ends for which it is exercised will then have been accomplished; and because those ends involve all that is necessary to prepare the way for the safe and wise institution of the opposite administration that is thereafter to be exercised. Why else should this dispensation, in which such a stupendous exemplification of the heart of man is wrought out—continue to that time? Would not that new and more gracious administration have been introduced at a far earlier

period? This is, indeed, expressly taught by the apostle in the epistle to the Romans, xi. 25-32, "For I would not have you ignorant, brethren, of this mystery (lest ye should be wise in your own conceits) that blindness in part has happened to Israel, *until* the fulness [full complement] of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved, as it is written; out of Zion shall come the Deliverer, and he shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." Here the salvation of Israel at the time of Christ's second coming, is represented as somehow to be the result of the previous dispensation, during which they had been smitten with blindness; while an elect number of Gentiles were taken out of their countless crowds, and made partakers of redemption. But the apostle proceeds to state, that the long apostasy to which they were successively left, was directly in order to the salvation of both. "For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy *through their unbelief*; even so have these also now not believed that through *your mercy* they also may obtain mercy. *For God has delivered them all over to unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all.*" He thus specifically represents that God's delivering all over to unbelief under the present dispensation, during which such an exemplification is wrought of their alienation, debasement, and malevolence, is expressly *in order that he might have mercy upon all, both Israelites and Gentiles*, under the dispensation that is to succeed this. It is an essential condition, accordingly, to the renovation and redemption of the world that is then to be accomplished; an indispensable preparative to the gift of the infinite blessings that are then to be conferred on the race.

But how is it to be such a preparative to that dispensation? How is it that the demonstration of the truths which it displays is to make it safe, wise, and glorious to bestow the blessings of renovation, pardon, and life on the whole race through the long series of ages denoted by the millennium, which are now restricted to so small a number?

It will present a vast and overwhelming demonstration that the race are identically such beings in alienation, perverseness, and guilt, as God exhibits them in the work of redemption: a truth, which it is of infinite moment that men themselves, and the whole universe, should see with the

clearest certainty, and feel with the profoundest impression. For how else would it be known and realized, that all the infinite myriads who are to be saved during the vast round of the millennial age, will owe their renovation, sanctification, and redemption, to the same infinite grace that accomplishes the salvation of believers now? As they are to be kept by their exemption from the tempting influences of Satan, by their early regeneration and by their high sanctification from strong exhibitions of native alienation, would there not be danger of their mistaking the character they would have exhibited, had they lived in the former dispensation, were it not for the demonstrations of it with which they are to be furnished by the race now? Would not the gazing hosts of the surrounding universe lack the requisite proofs of the hopeless state from which the grace of God is then to rescue from age to age the teeming millions with which the world is to be peopled? The infinite and impressive exemplifications, however, that are now taking place, will leave them in no uncertainty. There will be no possibility of failing to see that they are saved from utter enmity, from hopeless incorrigibleness, from eternal destruction.

It will be seen with equal clearness what the rights of God are; that he might with perfect justice, if he chose, withhold his Spirit from those whom he redeems; and that their salvation is wholly of sovereign grace: truths also, the demonstration of which is indispensable to his vindication, in the punishment of those whom he leaves to perish, and to the right appreciation by the universe of the power, wisdom, and love which he exercises in the redemption of those whom he saves. For if there were no such exemplification as now takes place of God's right to leave men to the dominion of their evil passions, and punish them for their sins, would there not be danger of its being assumed or surmised that he is bound to keep his creatures from revolting and perishing; and thence of impiously inferring that if they fall into sin, the blame attaches to him rather than to them? If there were no actual inflictions of the penalties of sin in the second death, would not the race and the universe be left without a proper knowledge of the nature and depth of the ruin from which they are rescued, whom he makes partakers of his salvation?

It will be seen also, and felt with equal strength, what the just deserts of sin are, and what the dreadful wickedness and miseries are, of which they are for ever to be the vassals who apostatize from God, and seek for happiness in revolt from him. Those who perish are to be examples for ever to the universe, of what creatures become who are given up to the unrestrained domination of evil, and everlasting monuments of the just wrath of God; and will enable the redeemed themselves, and all orders of intelligences, to see from what they are delivered who are saved. And such a sight of what it is to be for ever lost, is undoubtedly necessary in order to their feeling an adequate sense of the greatness and grandeur of the salvation to which they are exalted. Were there no such exemplification of what it is to meet the penalties of sin, their views would doubtless be wholly inadequate and faint, of their obligations to the grace that saves them.

It may, perhaps, be thought that these awful exhibitions of man, of sin, and of wrath, have been carried further than the vindication of God, or the instruction and impression of the universe can require. That he, however, has chosen that they should proceed to such an extent, proves that exemplifications of them on such a scale, and through such a series of ages, is indispensable to the ends that are to be answered by it. The crowds who perish, great as they are, are yet to the infinite millions of the universe of holy beings not only, but to the infinite millions that are finally to be redeemed, but as a drop to the ocean, but as a particle of mist to the measureless waters of the globe. The period of the present dispensation compared to those which are to follow during which the redemption of the race is to continue, is but as a moment to a round of interminable years.

And finally, it will be seen with the clearest certainty, and realized with the deepest impression, that all those who are redeemed, however distant the day may be in which they are called into existence, and whatever the dispensation may be that is exercised over them, are saved by the sacrifice, righteousness, and intercessions of Christ, and that all the glory of their redemption, all the beauty of the holiness, wisdom, and blessedness to which they are exalted, are the result of his work.

And these infinite demonstrations,—these resistless convictions, carried to every heart in the holy universe, will thus make it sure that the work of redemption at all its future stages, however remote the ages on ages may be, will be truly understood by all the orders of beings, and all individuals who are spectators of it; and will, therefore, make it consistent with the safety of his kingdom, that God should, after the close of the present dispensation, and a short period after the termination of the thousand years of the saints' reign with Christ—during which a fresh revolt is to be permitted—carry on the redemption of the race through an endless series of generations, without a further exemplification of these truths.

With what propriety may we repeat the exclamation to which the apostle was prompted by this wondrous measure of divine love:—"O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" That is, how infinitely the wisdom of the measures he takes to accomplish at length the full redemption of the race, transcend the grasp of our powers! And as they are to unfold on a larger and larger scale through the endless ages of the future, how are their wonderfulness and beauty for ever to overpass our comprehension!

These views of the administration God is now exercising, and the office it is to subserve in preparing the universe for that which is to follow, are especially entitled to consideration at the present time, when so many signals seem to indicate that a fresh storm of divine judgments, that belong to the last plagues, is soon to descend on the nations, which antichrist holds as his vassals, and that the great tragedy of apostasy and of vengeance is rapidly drawing to a close. They are the only views that furnish a satisfactory solution of the past and of the present, and throw the light of beauty and hope over the future. The belief ordinarily entertained, that the earth is to subsist but about a thousand years longer; that during that period there is to be no conversion of mankind universally, but only a more general reception of the gospel than at the present time: and that the race is then to reach its destined number, multiplication cease, and the two classes of which it consists, be assigned to their final

awards, is gloomy indeed to the Christian heart, and inconsistent with the divine attributes and purposes as they are delineated in the inspired volume; as it implies that but a small share of the race are to be saved, and that the great object of God's procedure towards the world through its whole period is, to display his justice and destroy, not to show forth his wisdom, power, and love in saving;—to make the destruction of those who perish the means of a more comprehensive salvation of others, so that the number of the lost shall be but as a drop to an ocean, compared to the infinite millions of the redeemed.

These views, however, which throw so bright an irradiance over the interminable future, are consonant with the divine attributes; are in harmony with the great purposes which God has revealed of perpetuating the race, and continuing its redemption for ever; and they are eminently suited to give support under the destructive judgments that are soon to be rained upon the nations. Amidst the dreadful tempests with which the earth is to be swept, let us rejoice and give glory to God, that they are among the last plagues that are to be poured from the vials of his vengeance; and hail the dawn of the great day, when voices from heaven shall proclaim that the kingdom of this world has become our Lord's and that he is to reign for ever and ever; and the song of Moses and the Lamb shall resound through the heavens: "Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy: for all nations shall come and worship before thee; because thy judgments are made manifest."

#### ART. VIII.—THE ETHICAL SYSTEM OF THE BIBLE.

DISCOURSES ON TRUTH. Delivered in the Chapel of the South Carolina College, by James H. Thornwell, D.D., President and Chaplain. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1855.

THIS volume, though treating of but a single branch of morals, is an important addition to our works on that sub-



ject. It is written with great simplicity, directness, and point; is free from the shadowy and delusive speculations in which so many writers indulge; and presents the truth with a boldness and dignity that are suitable to its character; rising occasionally to a largeness and beauty of views that are unusually impressive, and here and there darting flashes of light on points which others have mystified and perplexed, that lift them into the blaze of day, and give the reader the feeling that he is in the hand of a guide who is leading him into the green pastures, and beside the still waters that greet the eye and refresh the heart in the cloudless realms of eternal truth.

But a special merit of the work is, that it takes the Bible as a source and standard of ethical principles, and shows in respect to the theme of which it treats, on the one hand, that all the laws of morals are in harmony with its teachings; and on the other, that on several of the most important subjects, such as the rights of God, future rewards, the nature of holiness, and the method of redemption, it gives us knowledge of the utmost importance which we could never derive in an adequate measure from the light of nature. Thus he says:—

“As a specimen of the richness and compass of Scripture morality, I shall single out the duty of *truth*. Before entering on it, however, I deem it not unimportant to make a few remarks upon the ethical teachings of the Scriptures, with a view to determine what there is that is peculiar to revelation, and what is the real nature and extent of our obligations to the Bible. This will lead us to a just estimate of secular morality, and perhaps impress us with a deeper sense of the priceless value of the gospel. It is precisely because they do not comprehend the ethical relations of Christianity, that many of the educated men of the country undervalue its importance. If asked what it is, and what it proposes to do for men, and what kind of offices it exacts from them, it is amazing how crude and ill-digested their notions would oftentimes appear to be.”—Pp. 14, 15.

And he proceeds to specify some of these peculiarities:—

“1. So far as the simple knowledge of duty is concerned, we may err, on the one hand, by exaggerating the necessity of revelation, and on the other by exaggerating the sufficiency of reason.

There can be no doubt that morality is a subject which falls within the province of natural light. To say that we are dependent on the word and oracle of God, 'not only in those points of faith which concern the great mysteries of the deity, of the creation, of the redemption, but likewise those which concern the law moral truly interpreted; to say that we can have from the dictates of conscience only negative conceptions of rectitude, sufficient to check the vices but not to inform the duty,' is to contradict alike the testimony of Scripture, and the experience of mankind. 'For [one of the ethical truths which the Bible teaches is, that] when the Gentiles which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves.' A being without the sense of obligation, and a spontaneous recognition of the fundamental differences of right and wrong, would not be responsible. He could not form the remotest notion of duty, and the language of the authority and law might as well be addressed to stocks and stones. The elemental principles of right which are involved in the very conception of a moral nature, must be conceded to man as man. They are the birthrights of his being, and not the legacy of a subsequent revelation. An intelligent creature, without primitive belief to determine and regulate the operations of the cognitive faculties, would be no greater absurdity, than a moral and responsible creature without primitive laws of right, to determine and regulate the operations of moral judgment. But it is equally an error to maintain that, because the Scriptures pre-suppose the moral constitution of man, they are of little or no importance, considered as a *rule* of life. It is one thing to say that reason is a law, and another to say that it is a perfect law. In our present fallen condition, it is impossible to excogitate a standard of duty, which shall be warped by none of our prejudices, distorted by none of our passions, and corrupted by none of our habits. We are liable to as great perversions of the original principle of right as of the original principles of truth. The elements of reason have no power to secure their just application. There never has appeared an absolutely perfect rule of duty, among any nations, however civilized and cultivated, that were destitute of revelation. It is only of the law of the Lord, as contained in the Scriptures, that we can justly say, it is perfect. There are two respects in which every natural system of morality is likely to be found wanting. In the first place, the difficulty of reproducing in reflection the spontaneous processes of conscience, and of seizing upon its fundamental laws in their integrity and completeness, render it next to impossible, that the verbal generalizations of philosophy shall exactly represent the operations of the mind. Something is apt to be omitted or added. The danger is enhanced by the difficulty of distinguishing betwixt

prejudices of education and natural principles ; it is easy to confound a crotchet with a principle, to make a maxim of a habit of thought. In the next place, the application of these fundamental laws, supposing them properly eliminated, to the concrete cases of life, requires great delicacy and caution. We are as likely to go wrong, from misapplying a true principle, as from adopting a false one. The heathen father admits the great law of parental affection ; he misapplies it when he murders his infant child, to save him from the miseries of life. The heathen son recognises the duty of filial piety ; he reasons badly upon it when he puts his aged parents to death. Here our depravity exerts its power ; it is a constant temptation to pervert the original principle of right, and make light darkness, and darkness light. It is here, too, that the principal defects of every natural scheme of morality are exhibited. True principles are falsely applied. It is not so much that the law is wrong, that the prime data are questionable, though they are often defective, as that the law is not legitimately carried out, its proper applications are not seen, limitations and exceptions are superinduced by our circumstances, and we envelop ourselves in a cloud, and the result is, that a deceived heart turns us aside. The Scriptures, as an authoritative rule of duty, guard against these defects. They prescribe the law in its fulness and integrity, they illustrate its application by description and example, they indicate the prejudices which are likely to pervert us, and signalize the spirit which will always insure obedience. By the infallibility of their results, they are of inestimable value to the moral philosopher himself. Where his speculations contradict their statements he knows that there is an error in his processes ; he retraces his steps and continues to renew his investigations, until he discovers the secret of his miscarriage. They serve the same purpose to him which the answer to its sum serves to the child in learning his arithmetic. They are at once a guide and a check to his speculations. Paley has depreciated the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule, from the absurd notion that if they were admitted to be complete, they would dispense with the use of moral philosophy. He took it for granted that the sole business of philosophy was to furnish rules ; and of course if they are already furnished to our hands, there is no need for its investigations. He has very singularly confounded moral philosophy with the moral constitution of man, and because the Scriptures 'presuppose in the persons to whom they speak, a knowledge of the principles of natural justice ;' that is, because they presuppose a conscience, or sense of the fundamental differences of right and wrong, he gravely concludes that they exact of men, in order to be understood, some tincture of philosophy. But it is one thing to be a moral agent, and quite another to be a moral philoso-

pher. The Scriptures certainly expect that those to whom they speak, are possessed of those principles of practical common sense, without which their instructions are utterly unmeaning and absurd. But to possess these principles is not to be a philosopher. Philosophy implies reflection, speculation—it is questioning the spontaneous processes of mind—thought returning upon itself, and seeking the nature, authority, and criterion of its own laws. The Scriptures, consequently, in presenting an adequate and perfect rule of life, are far from dispensing with speculation. They leave untouched its peculiar work. The moral nature, in its phenomenal variety and essential unity, still invites the researches of the curious, and the more it is studied, the more conspicuous will appear the absolute sufficiency of the Bible. The law of the Lord is perfect.

“2. The superior efficiency of the Bible is universally conceded by all who admit a revelation at all. It teaches duty with greater certainty, and enforces it by motives of greater power. Dr. Paley thinks this the great merit of the Scriptures; and that it is a merit of incalculable importance will at once appear, by reflecting on the tendency of temptation to blind the mind to the truth of the law, or the danger of the consequences. Whatever certifies the rule, or illustrates the misery of disobedience, assaults temptation in its stronghold, and strips transgression of its favorite plea. The certainty of the law is put beyond question in the Scriptures, because it rests upon the immediate authority of God. It is not a deduction of reason to be questioned, but a divine command to be obeyed. The power of the sanctions is found in the unlimited control which he who promulgates the law, possesses of the invisible world. The legal motives of the Scriptures are projected on a scale of inconceivable grandeur. The Bible deals with the vast, the awful, the boundless. If it addresses our hopes and proposes the prospect of future happiness, it is an exceeding, an eternal weight of glory it dispenses. Does it remind us of a judgment to come? God is the judge, and earth and hell the subjects, angels the spectators, and the complexion of eternity the doom. Does it address our fears? It reminds us of a worm that never dies, a fire that is never quenched, the blackness of darkness for ever. It is a grand system: it springs from the bosom of an infinite God, and opens a field of infinite interests. Eternity is the emphasis it gives to its promises, the terror it imparts to its cure. Conscience, under the tuition of nature, may dread the future; it is the prerogative of revelation alone to lay it bare. Conscience may tremble, but revelation alone can show how justly the fears have been excited. Hence the Bible is without a rival, when it speaks in the language of command. It wields the thunder of infinite power, as well as utters the voice of infinite righteousness. Still its mighties t

sanctions are not what may be called its legal motives. The scheme of redemption, in its conception and evolution, is a sublime commentary upon the soundness and supremacy of right, which, while it reveals the ineffable enormity of sin, presents the character of God in such an aspect of venerable grandeur, that holiness becomes awful and majestic, and we insensibly adore under the moral impression it makes. He that stands beneath the cross and understands the scene, dares not sin—not because there is a hell beneath him, or an angry God above him, but because holiness is felt to reign there;—the ground on which he treads is sacred; the glory of the Lord encircles him; and, like Moses, he must remove the shoes from his feet. The cross is a venerable spot; I love to linger around it, not merely that I may read my title to everlasting life, but that I may study the greatness of God. God never appears to be so truly great, so intensely holy, as when, from the pure energy of principle, he gives himself in the person of his Son, to die rather than that his character should be impugned. Who dares to prevaricate with moral distinctions, and talk of death as a greater evil than dishonour, when God the mighty Maker died, rather than that truth or justice should be compromised? Who at the foot of Calvary can pronounce sin to be a slight matter? Here, then, lies the most impressive sanction of Revelation. Not content to promulgate the law with absolute certainty, to put under tribute the whole resources of the invisible world, to lay its hand upon eternity, and make heaven and hell its ministers; it rises yet higher, and seeks to impress us with a subduing sense of the sacredness of right—to make us feel how awful goodness is; it reveals its inherent greatness—unveils its ineffable glory. It does not describe it, but shows it; and we return from the cross with emotions similar to those of Moses, when the name of the Lord was proclaimed, and the goodness of the Lord passed before him in the cleft of the rock. It is the scheme of redemption which crowns the ethical teachings of the Bible. The lesson is sealed at the cross—there, and there only, do we shudder at sin for its own sake, and reverence right for itself.

“3. But impressive as the general truths of morality are rendered, by the tragedy of redemption, that would be an inadequate view of the extent of its contributions which stopped at that point. It goes beyond giving certainty and power to the doctrines of nature. It teaches lessons, and lessons of incalculable value, which philosophy could never have dreamed of. It opens a new chapter in the book of ethics, and invites us to speculations as refreshing by their novelty as they are invigorating by their truth. It is not sufficiently recollected that the doctrines of the Scriptures in relation to the destiny of man, the nature of holiness, and the means of grace, are answers to the

very questions which were earnestly and anxiously agitated in the schools of ancient wisdom, and which the sages of Greece and Rome proved themselves incompetent to solve. I am ashamed to add that they are answers which multitudes with the Bible in their hands have failed to comprehend, and have consequently been left to grope, as if struck by judicial blindness, in a thicker darkness than ever enshrouded the gifted minds of paganism. There is a tenfold nearer approximation to the teachings of the Bible in Aristotle than there is in Paley—more affinity with the gospel in Cicero, than in the whole tribe of utilitarians.”—Pp. 15–27.

He proceeds to exemplify this in respect to the teachings of the Scriptures in regard to what constitutes true happiness, the nature of holiness, and the means by which men are to attain the end of their being; and then treats, in the remainder of the volume, of truth, the love of it, and the various forms of sincerity, faithfulness, vows, and consistency, in which that love manifests itself.

He thus places his subject on quite a different ground from that on which it is usually exhibited, and assigns it a far wider scope. The chief writers on ethics do not recognise the Bible as a source of knowledge on some of its most important branches that cannot be drawn from the light of nature, and scarcely regard it as of authority. Their great objects are, first, to determine what the foundation of virtue is—that is, what the element is by which actions are virtuous, and obligatory on the conscience; and next what the particular actions are which embody that element, and which it is a duty therefore to exercise. Some hold that that element is utility, some that it is benevolence, some that it is the fact that conscience approves of them, some that actions are prompted by instinct or natural emotions, and some that they are conformed to public opinion and custom. God is accordingly left almost altogether out of consideration in their systems, not only as an object of ethical feeling and action, but as a lawgiver and teacher; and the subject is treated as though it had no relation except to man, and instead of lying in any measure within the sphere of revelation, as belonging wholly to the domain of natural reason; consequently many of their systems are alike subversive of religion and morality. The error of this method is manifest from many considerations.

1. It is seen from the fact that God is himself immeasurably the greatest and most immediate object of ethical action. He is not only the being to whom awe, love, trust, adoration, submission, and obedience in all its forms are directly due, but as men are responsible to him for all their conduct towards fellow-creatures, there is not a single moral act which they exert towards one another that has not an immediate relation to him, and the just comprehension of which, therefore, does not require a knowledge and recognition of him, his rights, and his will. For his moral subjects being his property, and designed for his service, the violation of their rights is the violation of his, and the observance of their rights the observance of his. And as his rights immeasurably transcend theirs, and are proportional in greatness to the infinitude of his attributes, and the vastness of the interests that depend on the maintenance of his government, a knowledge of his being and relations is necessary to a just understanding of the obligations of virtue, and the guilt of transgressing its laws. He who, knowing nothing of Jehovah, commits murder under the impression that he sins only against a fellow-creature, sees but a small part of the crime which he perpetrates. He measures his guilt by the insignificance of the worm whose life he destroys, instead of the majesty of the being who created and owns that worm, and has the rights of its creator, as well as its conservator and vindicator. This interest of God in all the moral acts of his creatures invests the laws of morality with their highest significance, and makes a knowledge of him indispensable to a true estimate of them. But this knowledge is derivable only from the Scriptures. He has nowhere else revealed himself in his relations to man, asserted his rights as creator and moral governor, and shown how they enhance the obligations of morality. But there he exhibits himself as the creator and ruler of his moral subjects, as the author of the laws of morality, as having the right to enforce them, as regarding every violation of them as a sin against himself, and as designing to reward both the observance and the violation of them by everlasting retributions. They accordingly who leave out of view this great feature of man's moral obligations, gain not a glimpse of their true nature.

2. As God is the author of his moral creatures and their re-

lations, and determines the conditions in which they are called to act, he has a perfect knowledge of what their moral duties are, and of their obligations to fulfil them. It is certain, therefore, that no error is committed by him in the views he gives of their moral constitution, the nature of the acts they are bound to exert, or the merits or demerits of the course they pursue. No false theory of their nature lurks in his laws; no mistaken estimate of their capacities, nor misjudgment of the effect of violent temptation on their obligation to resist it; and no erroneous views of the consequences which obedience and rebellion draw in their train. Every claim he institutes, every assertion he makes of a right, is in conformity with his and their natures and relations. Every tint he employs in depicting the character of virtue, every hue he uses in delineating the sinfulness of vice, is according to truth, and exhibits them in their genuine colors. Who that would make himself acquainted with the true principles of ethics, would not avail himself of the portraiture drawn by this infallible pencil? To reject it, and turn rather to the distorted sketches of our dim and flickering reason, is to prefer uncertainty to knowledge, error to truth, the darkness and turbulence of sin to the serene light and peace of virtue. Yet these delineations of man and his duties by the all-seeing and all-wise, most of the speculatists on the subject of morals have wholly overlooked. They have preferred to grope in the darkness of midnight, rather than bask in the light of day: they have chosen the blindness of reason and passion as their guide, instead of his wisdom; and have misjudged accordingly in the grossest manner of man and his duties; sometimes exalting him to the dignity of a deity, and sometimes depressing him to the level of the brutes; sometimes degrading his virtues to the rank of vices; and still more frequently treating his vices as virtues, and consecrating his pride, his selfishness, and his ambition, as offerings of homage to God.

3. But God is as infinite in holiness as he is in intelligence; and his love of righteousness and hatred of sin are as perfect as his comprehension is of their nature; and these characteristics mark all the representations he gives of the beauty of the one, and the evil of the other. He sets them forth in colors with which no other being can invest them,



in the approval or disapprobation he expresses of them, and the blessing or curse he makes their eternal reward. To virtue he gives the sanction of his rectitude; he honors it with his love; while in the reprobation and punishment of sin, he utters against it the most emphatic testimony he can pronounce. And these proofs of their respective natures are immeasurably stronger and more impressive than can be derived from any other source. No other token of the excellence of virtue can be so majestic, as that infinite righteousness and goodness love it: no other can be so awful of the evil of sin, as that infinite purity and rectitude hate and punish it with endless wrath. Who that earnestly seeks for just views of their natures, would not contemplate the manifestation he thus makes of them with the profoundest awe and admiration, and welcome to his heart the impressions they are adapted to produce? To turn away from the dazzling light in which he thus sets them forth, to the feeble glimmer of reason, to the faint and often contradictory testimony of men, is to prefer the weakness and confusion of man to the strength and wisdom of God; the darkness and hideousness of sin, to the glow and beauty of holiness.

4. But God has framed and established his government over men in the presence of enemies as well as of his holy children, and allows and causes all its principles and laws to be subjected to a scrutiny, that if there were the slightest deviation in them from right, the least defect in truthfulness, wisdom, or benignity, it would be discovered, and divest him for ever of the confidence of his holy creatures, and shroud him and his kingdom in eternal darkness. The fallen angels and men are under the greatest possible motive to detect some flaw, if possible, in his government, that could convict him of injustice, release them from allegiance, and convert their rebellion into a virtue. Could the towering genius of Satan discover one such defect, it would set him free in a great degree from his guilt, and subvert the throne of the Almighty. Thousands of gifted men also have scanned, and are still scanning, the measures of his government with the most eager desire to find in them some ground for impeaching his wisdom, his justice, or his benevolence; and could they succeed, would regard it as an apology for their rebellion. His administration is subjected

to the most eager scrutiny also, we have reason to believe, by all other orders of intelligent beings. The question whether his government of this fallen world is perfectly righteous, perfectly wise, and perfectly benevolent, is probably the greatest that has ever been agitated by the holy universe, and engaged their most earnest consideration. Are his rights over men in their fallen state truly such as he assumes in his laws and the penalties he inflicts for their transgressions? Are men in that condition under obligation to render the perfect obedience he requires? Does he treat sin and sinners according to their true character in the method he has instituted for their pardon? Is there no relinquishment of his rights; is there no relaxation of his law in forgiving and accepting sinners? Are all those who perish treated according to their true character and deserts? Are all those who are pardoned and admitted to heaven, truly freed from sin, and made meet by the renovation of their hearts for his kingdom? Is the work of Christ an adequate ground for the redemption that is founded on it? Are justice and mercy truly harmonized in it; and righteousness and peace made to unite with each other? Instead of eclipsing, are all the divine perfections unfolded in it in a brighter effulgence? These are the most momentous inquiries that ever engaged the interest of intelligent beings; and have undoubtedly been contemplated and weighed with the profoundest attention by every order of holy creatures in God's empire. And this piercing scrutiny continued from age to age, and ever to result, as it has hitherto, in the vindication of God, renders it infinitely certain that there is nothing in God's providence but what will bear the most thorough investigation, and prove to be perfect. His wisdom has guarded against every just or plausible ground of impeachment or suspicion. Every principle of his government, every law, every measure, is stamped with perfect righteousness, wisdom, and goodness. Every delineation he has given of sin, every portraiture he has drawn of holiness, is in exact accordance with their nature. Those who perish are in nature and character precisely what he exhibits them as being: and those who are saved, have precisely the new affections ascribed to them in his word, and are forgiven on the ground on which that places their pardon. And God,

accordingly, is to make known to the universe in a public judgment, the nature of his procedure, and its accordance with the conduct of men, that the whole of his holy subjects may have the most ample and absolute proof of his unspotted rectitude. That his ways are to be subject to such a scrutiny constitutes accordingly another proof that they are marked by unsullied purity, by perfect benevolence. A being of infinite intelligence and wisdom, and on whose procedure the well-being of the universe depends, could not possibly admit any principle or act into his government that could contradict his attributes, shroud his character in eclipse, and involve the destruction of his kingdom. What a sublime assurance this consideration gives of the perfection of his administration !

5. The truth and righteousness of God's laws are confirmed by the sanction they receive from the reason and consciences of men. Their uprightness is felt by all men who are acquainted with them, just in proportion as they understand their nature : not an individual who has fairly considered them, has ever been able honestly to escape the conviction that they are just, wise, and obligatory. The only mode in which men extricate themselves from the feeling of their rightfulness and title to obedience is, by dismissing them from consideration, warping their judgment by sophistry, stifling the voice of conscience in a flood of sinful indulgences, or suffering it to be overpowered by the clamors of the noisy and bewildering crowd. They are the instruments of all the compunctions of conscience that take place in our world : their truth and holiness are recognised in all the convictions of sin that are felt by men in their natural state, and all the thoughts and impressions that arouse them to a sense of their obligations and danger : and God has only to shed forth the enlightening and subduing power of his Spirit, and there is not a heart on earth, no matter how callous or perverse, that will not instantly be penetrated with a resistless conviction of their perfect righteousness, and sink overwhelmed with the feeling that its guilt in violating them is precisely such as God represents it.

What a confirmation this fact yields to their perfect rectitude ? When God arraigns the race at his bar, and makes known the character of his proceedings with them, not an

individual will be found even among his most audacious and remorseless enemies, who will be able to impeach him of the faintest injustice either in his laws, his administration of them over men during their probation, or the retributions he assigns those who obey and who break them through an immortal existence. "At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of those in heaven, and those on earth, and those under the earth, and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

6. And finally, their rectitude is shown by the fact that all who are renewed in knowledge and righteousness by the Spirit of God, recognise their truth and righteousness, and receive them as the exponent, at once, of his rights and of their duty. All their recognitions of his rights; all their convictions of sin; all their submission to his government; all their adoration of his perfections; all their sense of his grace in the work of redemption; all their trust in his promises; all their delight in his service; and all their joy at the prospect of everlasting blessedness in his kingdom, are based on their sight and sense of the perfect rectitude of his requirements and prohibitions, the rewards and the penalties that constitute his moral government. And that will lie at the foundation of all their obedience and all their bliss through their immortal existence. Not a holy emotion will ever spring into existence in their spirits; not a pulse of love will ever throb in their hearts; not an accent of adoration will ever burst from their lips, but it will have as its ground, the unclouded and rapturous realization that justice and judgment are the habitation of his throne; that the dazzling splendors of holiness invest all his measures and ways.

But we not only have the utmost certainty that the laws of the Bible are absolutely perfect, expressing the truth in its greatness and minuteness, both of God's rights and man's obligations; the sacred volume presents also a far fuller statement and exemplification of those rights and duties, a far vaster sum of information respecting them than is to be found in any other quarter, whether it be conscience, human laws, the speculations of reason, or the history of men.

In the first place, the volume of revelation presents a

clear and comprehensive statement and assertion of the rights of God as creator, preserver, benefactor, and moral governor over men. It specifies the affections with which he is to be regarded, and the modes in which they are to be expressed, and points out and prohibits the affections and acts that are violations of his rights. It makes known the great principles and ends of his moral government, indicates the way in which men are to secure his favor, and foreshows the consequences he is to annex to their conduct towards him. No knowledge of these great subjects approaching at all that which the Bible presents, can be drawn from any other source.

In the next place, it presents a like perfect exposition of man's nature and obligations to God, and points out all the duties he owes him, and the rewards of good or evil that will attend his conduct in relation to him. Every form of affection is specified and enjoined which it becomes him to cherish towards God, and the modes in which they are to be expressed; and every feeling and act is prohibited that is inconsistent with his relations and a violation of the divine rights. No such ample information can be drawn from any other source.

In the third place, there is a perfect specification, also, of all the duties which mankind owe to each other, in their several relations, as husbands, wives, parents, and children, brothers and sisters, or other relations, masters and servants, neighbors, members of the same community, magistrates and citizens, subjects of the same and of another government. It indicates the spirit by which they are to be actuated in every sphere of life, and specifies the duties that are appropriate to every condition in which they are placed; while, on the other hand, it presents an equally vast and perfect enumeration of the affections and actions that are violations of those rights and laws. The attempt to construct a system of ethics independently of it, is little less absurd than it were to form one without a reference to man. Had the writers who have treated of the theme taken it as their guide and submitted themselves to its teachings, they would have been withheld from the crude and contradictory speculations, they would have escaped the fatal errors that now characterize a large share of their works.

In the fourth place, it gives in its histories of the conduct of men, and of the actings of their consciences in respect to these laws, a vast enumeration, on the one hand, of the false and evil sentiments with which the wicked regard them; and on the other, an equal exemplification of the just views and holy affections with which they are contemplated by those who are renewed. Not a sinful emotion or act ever sprang into existence in the agency of a human being, but it may be found depicted there, and with the brand of reprobation stamped on it. Not a holy affection ever trembled into existence in the breast of one whom the Spirit of God has restored to virtue, but it is drawn there in its genuine features, and invested with the hues of heaven.

The Bible is thus a perfect map of the whole realm of ethics, divine and human; exhibiting all the rights of God and man on the one hand, and all the duties of men on the other; specifying all the acts which the law of God enjoins, and all that it prohibits; and finally, presenting a vivid picture, on the one side, of the remorseful feelings with which men regard their violations of these laws; and a living portraiture, on the other, of the peaceful and joyous affections with which the consciences of the renewed regard obedience to them. As a source of ethical instruction then, as a teacher of morals, the Bible infinitely transcends all others. It is the only fountain from which a just and comprehensive knowledge of the subject can be gained.

---

#### ART. IX.—THE WAR OF THE GREAT NATIONS.

NEARLY all the leading events of the contest in the East, thus far, have been of an extraordinary nature, and against apparent probabilities. Such were the repeated defeats of the Russians by the Turks on the Danube, and their retreat from the Principalities. Such were the unobstructed landing of the Allies in the Crimea, and their victory over the Russians on the Alma. Such, in a still higher degree, were their successful resistance of the Russians at Balaklava and Inkermann, where a handful of English and French withstood the onset of vast masses for hours, and after almost

unexampled slaughter, drove them back in defeat. Not less unexpected and extraordinary, on the other hand, have been the skill and success with which the Russians have defended Sebastopol; the peculiar obstacles the Allies have had to encounter; and above all, the almost total ruin of the English army by the mere incompetence and negligence of the officers and government. There is not one of these but lies out of the ordinary range of occurrences, and would have been deemed by military men altogether improbable.

But an event still more extraordinary, and lying wholly out of the sphere of human foresight and calculation, is the sudden disappearance of the late Czar from the scene, and transference of the task of conducting the war at its most critical juncture to other hands, which, however pledged to adhere to his policy, cannot be expected to pursue it with either his commanding authority, or his indomitable will. In whatever relation it is viewed, it startles the mind, and excites the feeling that consequences of the utmost moment are to spring from it. To him it was an occurrence of infinite significance; the change it wrought in his condition, his relations, his prospects, transcending the power of imagination to conceive. From the greatest monarch on earth, having an absolute sway over sixty millions of fellow-creatures, and exerting a vast influence on the whole civilized world, he sank in an instant from authority, and passed into the invisible world as unattended by guards, courtiers, and dependents, and as helpless and solitary, as the meanest and most unknown of his serfs. With what a startling realization must that truth have flashed upon his spirit as he emerged from the strife of death, and in place of the ambitious scenes in which he had been acting here, found himself in the realms of the disembodied, with the prospect of an interminable retributive existence before him for the blood-guilt of hundreds of thousands of fellow-men whom he had consigned to the grave! And what consternation must have smitten him when accosted by that vast crowd of victims to his pride and ambition, with the taunts and reproaches addressed by the dead to the fallen monarch of Babylon! "Art thou also become weak as we? Art thou become like unto us? Thy pomp is brought down to the

grave, the noise of thy viols: the worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee. How art thou fallen from heaven, oh, Lucifer! son of the morning! How art thou cut down that didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven; I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will sit on the mount of the congregation in the sides of the north; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High: Yet thou shalt be brought down to hades; to the depths of the pit. Those seeing thee shall gaze at thee; they shall look at thee attentively and say: 'Is this the man that made the earth shake, that made kingdoms tremble, that made the world like a desert, destroyed the cities, and did not let his captives go home free?' " No tragic fall, no precipitation into the gulf of despair, can equal that of a monarch who is hurled from the pinnacle of human power which he has abused to the gratification of his selfishness, pride, and revenge, to a depth in the world of ruin, proportionate in the extremity of its horrors to the greatness of his crimes.

Important effects can scarcely fail to spring from his demise at this critical juncture. Its occurrence at the moment when the decision was to be made whether the war should be abandoned or continued, is doubtless an essential link in the great train of events that is to lead on to that catastrophe of the western monarchies which is at hand. Whether it is to contribute to that issue by weakening the power of Russia, inflaming the ambition of France, or inducing a new policy in Austria, or all of them together; or whether it is to produce a peace that shall prepare the way more directly for a revolution in Germany, Italy, and Great Britain, cannot now be foreseen. That the war, whether terminated soon, or after another campaign, is to weaken the power of Russia in the East, and intercept her designs on Turkey for a considerable period, there seems no reason to doubt. The Allies will not improbably accomplish the demolition of Sebastopol; and should they not, they are not likely to be driven to a pacification that does not place an effectual barrier to the supremacy of Russia in the Euxine. That she is to be weakened in the West also, and shorn of much of the influence she has exerted under the late Czar,



over Germany, Italy, and France, seems equally sure. The fancy, indeed, entertained by certain writers that she is to spread her conquests over the whole of Western Europe, has had nothing whatever in her condition to support it, and is wholly at war with the predictions of the Scriptures, which represent the monarchies symbolized by the horns of the wild beast, as to continue till their destruction at Christ's advent. Not a hint is given on the sacred page that the dragon—the representative in the present age of the civil head of the Greek church, is to conquer the wild beast, and take possession of its dominion; nor can the supposition of it be reconciled with the prediction made in the clearest manner, Rev. xix. 11–21, that the powers symbolized by the wild beast are to retain their supremacy till the great battle at Armageddon, when they are to be destroyed by the Son of God. The monarch who is to become the eighth king or imperial chief of the Western Roman empire, to whom the ten kings are to give their power and strength, Rev. xvii. 11–13, is to reside within the empire, not without it, like the monarch of Russia.

That the elements of revolution are rife in all the nations of the West, except France, the government of which has become strong, and is rapidly advancing in strength—is obvious to all eyes; and that crushed to the earth by remorseless despotisms, which by the very means they are obliged to employ to sustain themselves necessarily grow more and more oppressive every hour,—no improvement is possible in their condition except by revolutions, is equally clear. The population of Germany, Italy, and Spain, need but the coöperation of France to induce them instantly to overturn their present governments and institute new despotisms based on universal suffrage, like that of Napoleon III., and ally themselves with him. Nor is such a revolution impossible in Great Britain. So far from it, the extraordinary imbecility exhibited by the aristocracy in the conduct of the present war, is arousing the nation to a sense of the unsuitableness of their antiquated constitution to the present age, and is likely to lead to changes that will transfer the power of the government from the nobility to the people, and make a military despotism as essential to their government not improbably, as it is in France. Whether the great moment of these

changes is nigh or not, and whatever the line of events is to be that is to precede them, both the people and governments are so obviously and rapidly preparing for them, that their occurrence at any hour would scarcely excite surprise. There is no hint in the Apocalypse that the descent of the wild beast into hades took place unexpectedly to the nations, or impressed any one with astonishment. It was its emergence from the abyss after having sunk into its depths, and reappearance among the living, that caused them that dwell on the earth to wonder after the beast that was, and is not, and yet is. (Rev. xvii. 8.) The fall of the present old monarchies will astonish nobody. The rise of new despotisms in their place, like that of France, and in subordination probably to that power, will be unexpected, and strike the crowd with wonder.

Whatever the turn may be events take for the present, it becomes the children of God to watch them attentively, and recognise the indications which they present, that the great hour of judgment is at hand, and be ready for the duties and trials to which it may call them. The unexpected occurrences, the extraordinary catastrophes which have signalized the last ten months, indicate very impressively the ease with which the Most High can thwart his enemies, and make the haughty measures by which they attempt to defeat, the very means of accomplishing, the great purposes he has revealed in his word.

---

ART. X.—LITERARY AND CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. THE LIFE OF ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER, D.D., First Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey, by J. W. Alexander, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner. 1854.

DR. ALEXANDER'S peculiar mental traits, the stirring incidents of his early life, and the important influences he exerted in the church in his mature years, present an unusually fine theme for an entertaining and instructive biography. His intellect was of a cast in quickness, energy, and comprehensiveness, that broadly distinguished him from his contemporaries; his affections were eminently vivid and glowing;

his judgment sound, his temper generous, his power as an orator in person, voice, memory, and passion, of a high order, and he was animated with a good sense, promptness, diligence, zeal, and endurance, that enabled him to fill every sphere on which he entered, with dignity and success. The whole turn of his mind, manner, and life, was thus sufficiently peculiar to take him out of the realm of common-place, and give an air of freshness and novelty to his history; and his freedom from great faults, and his high excellence as a man, a preacher, a teacher, and a writer, makes it eminently safe and instructive. There are no sad chapters in it of fatal departures from the purity, dignity, and wisdom that become the sacred office; no recitals of eager and unscrupulous schemes of ambition; no details of a perversion of his office to the promotion of his personal aggrandizement; no records of apostasy from the truth, and attempts to draw away those who were placed under his influence from the faith once delivered to the saints, and mould them into partisans and propagators of another gospel. The picture is made up of soft and tasteful tints; it glows throughout with delicacy and beauty; and the bright hues of a cloudless heaven rest upon it.

The most delightful part of the volume to us is that which details the commencement of his religious life, and the events of his ministry in Virginia. There is no portion of the history of an individual that transcends in interest and beauty that of the dawn of his new existence, the first beam from the Sun of Righteousness that flashes upon his darkened spirit, and unfolds to its wondering gaze the glories of the Almighty, and lights it up with the smile of his love. The following is the description Dr. Alexander gives of the scene in which he first met that vision of God, and the transforming and transporting effect it wrought in him.

"As I proceeded to read aloud [to the family Flavel's *Method of Grace*] the truth took effect on my feelings, and every word I read seemed applicable to my own case. Before I finished the discourse, these emotions became too strong for restraint, and my voice began to falter. I laid down the book, rose hastily, and went out with a full heart, and hastened to my place of retirement. No sooner had I reached the spot than I dropped upon my knees, and attempted to pour out my feelings in prayer; but I had not continued many minutes in this exercise before I was overwhelmed with a flood of joy. It was transport such as I had never known before, and seldom since. I have no recollection of any distinct view of Christ; but I was filled with a sense of the goodness and mercy of God; and this joy was accompanied with a full assurance that my state was happy, and that if I was then to die I should go to heaven. This ecstasy

was too high to be lasting, but as it subsided my feelings were calm and happy. It soon occurred to me that possibly I had experienced the change called the new birth: but as I was walking homeward, the thought presented itself, that if this was indeed conversion, the effect would be that I should leave off all my sins; and I was willing to make this a criterion of my state. For a few days I guarded against everything which I knew to be wrong: but in a week my former feelings returned, and when exposed to temptation I transgressed as before. The next day the recollection filled me with unutterable anguish; for agreeably to my own judgment, my hopes of heaven, which had been so strong, were all blasted. I make no remark on this joyful frame; such experiences are not uncommon, and are often taken for conversion.

"While I was at Liberty I experienced exercises of mind which were remarkable. The place was a little out of the town in a thicket at the edge of a wood. I had in the morning walked out into this grove, and while thus engaged in meditation and prayer, I was suddenly visited with such a melting of heart as I never had before or since. Under a lively sense of divine goodness my eyes became a fountain of tears. The most prominent feelings were a sense of ingratitude for the innumerable mercies which had been richly and constantly showered upon me. When I now reflect upon it, it seems like a sudden change in the animal system, and a relief arising from a vent found for tears. The immediate result was a sweet composure of spirit. I cannot remember that I had any thought of Christ, or much contrition for my sins; and this melting frame, the counterpart of which I never experienced, led to no permanent change in my condition; in a few hours I felt much as before it occurred."

The progress of this conflict is further detailed in the following passage:

"The former part of the day I spent in the woods, ruminating on my sad condition and prospects. The train of my thoughts was, that I had enjoyed the very best means and opportunities of salvation, but these had produced no good effect; that I was now going where all were careless of these things, and where the means would be far less favorable. The conclusion forced itself upon me that I should certainly be lost for ever. My mind was calm and my thoughts deliberate, and when I came to this result I was nowise agitated, but began to contemplate the justice of God in my condemnation. It was evident to me that as a righteous governor he could not do otherwise than condemn me to hell, and I could not but approve the sentence of my own condemnation. Yet I felt that I could

never entertain any hard thoughts of God, even when suffering under his heavy displeasure. These views were so far from increasing my distress, that I experienced a degree of composure which I had not had for a long time. The awful question in regard to my destiny appeared now to be settled, and I felt no need of prayer or further waiting on God."

He had the impression at this time that far deeper convictions of sin than he had felt were requisite to his conversion. A friend, however, corrected that error.

"He answered that no certain degree of conviction was prescribed; that the only purpose which conviction could answer was to show us our need of Christ, and this, added he, you have. He then represented Christ as an Advocate before the throne of God, ready to undertake my cause, and able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him. A new view opened before me at this moment. I did feel that I needed a Saviour, and I knew that Christ as an Advocate was able to save me. This mere probability of salvation, after having given up all hope, was like the dawn of morning upon the dark night; it was like life from the dead. From that instant I entertained a joyful hope that I should yet be saved. These new views affected me exceedingly. I was like a man condemned to die, who is unexpectedly informed that there is a friend who can obtain a reprieve. I was unable to say anything. My tears prevented utterance."

He continued, however, under the impression that deeper realizations of his sinfulness, and a darker despair, were necessary conditions of his receiving the renewing influence of the Spirit. That feeling was raised to a climax by the distressful agitation of an acquaintance under a sense of sin.

"I was at once struck," he says, "by that event with the impression that I had received an irreparable injury from the clergyman who had persuaded me that no such conviction as this was necessary. I determined, therefore, to admit no hope until I should have the like experience. I read all the religious narratives I could procure, and labored much to put myself into the state into which they described themselves to have been before enjoying hope. But all these efforts and desires proved abortive, and I began to see much more of the wickedness of my own heart than ever before. I was distressed and discouraged, and convinced that I had placed too much dependence on mere means, and on my own efforts. I therefore determined to give myself incessantly to prayer until I found mercy, or perished in the pursuit.

"This resolution was formed on a Sunday evening. The next

morning I took my Bible and walked several miles into the dense wood of the Bushy Hills, which were then wholly uncultivated. Finding a place that pleased me at the foot of a projecting rock in a dark valley, I began with great earnestness the course which I had prescribed to myself. I prayed, I then read in the Bible, prayed and read, prayed and read, until my strength was exhausted, for I had taken no nourishment that day. But the more I strove, the harder my heart became, and the more barren was my mind of every serious or tender feeling. I tasted then some of the bitterness of despair. It seemed to me my last resource, and now this had utterly failed. I was about to desist from the endeavor, when the thought occurred to me that though I was helpless, and my case was nearly desperate, yet it would be well to cry to God to help me in this extremity. I knelt upon the ground, and poured out perhaps a single petition, or rather broken cry for help, when in a moment I had such a view of a crucified Saviour as is without parallel in my experience. The whole plan of grace appeared as clear as day. I was persuaded that God was willing to accept me just as I was, and convinced that I had never before understood the freeness of salvation, but had always been striving to bring some price in my hand, or to prepare myself for receiving Christ. Now I discovered that I could receive him in all his offices at that very moment, which I was sure at the time I did. I felt truly a joy that was unspeakable and full of glory. How long this delightful frame continued I cannot tell. But when my affections had a little subsided, I opened my Bible, and alighted on the eighteenth and nineteenth chapters of John. The sacred page appeared to be illuminated; the truths were new, as if I had never read them before; and I thought it would be always thus. . . . For several days my mind was serene. But before a week had elapsed, darkness began to gather over me again. Inbred corruption began to stir. In a word, I fell back into the same state of darkness and conflict as before."—Pp. 44–71.

He adds that, now "at the age of seventy-four, I am of opinion that my regeneration took place" at the time designated in the passage first quoted, a year before. What a vast train of events followed the beam of light flashed into his breast by the renewing Spirit in that secluded forest scene! How blissful, how majestic the train that is to follow through the circuit of his immortal life!

He was soon after licensed and began to preach, and often in the open air. Of the peculiarities of his person, the charm of his utterance, the cast of his thoughts, and his eminent success at this period the following description will enable the reader to judge.

"If we were more fully provided with reports other than his own

of these early efforts, we should doubtless find that in the estimation of all who heard them, they were of a high order. So far as he could be drawn out to speak of his own performances—a subject which he always avoided—these were equal to any public endeavors of his life. Great interest was added to his other qualities by the juvenile appearance of the preacher; indeed, he seemed but a little boy. His complexion was fair, his eye was dark and penetrating, and his voice according to every witness of that period was incomparably clear and flute-like. It always was both resonant and penetrating, but at this time was of a silvery tone both in speaking and singing. His fluency and command of words were extraordinary, and in those youthful discourses he gave full swing to an imagination which he learned more and more to chasten in later years.

“There are no circumstances which bring out the gift of pulpit eloquence more fully or speedily than those in which he was now placed. Going rapidly from assembly to assembly, followed by awakening and admiring crowds, in times of great revival, and during all the intervals plying the same work among warm and affectionate brethren by conversation, prayer, and praise, he was kept in that state of healthful and pleasurable excitement which animates and exalts the powers, and forms the habits of ready and powerful expression.

“So accustomed was he to associate pleasurable sensations with pulpit work, that even in later years he used to laugh at the notion of any one’s being injured by preaching. And it was commonly observed, through most of his life, that however depressed in spirits he might be before the service, he always came from it in the highest state of exhilaration. Never was he more free and full in conversation. These were the times at which to draw from him his most elevated religious discourse, as well as his liveliest narratives; and his own household, or those in which he was a guest, remember such hours with a pensive delight.”—Pp. 114, 115.

His ministry in Virginia and labors as president of Hampden Sidney College, continued for about sixteen years, and were eminently useful. The charm of the history of this part of his life, which abounds in novel and beautiful incidents, is heightened by graphic portraits drawn by his pen of many of the distinguished men in the ministry who had preceded or were contemporary with him. In 1806, he removed to Philadelphia, and continued to reside there till, in 1812, he entered on the professorship at Princeton, which he thenceforward filled with distinguished ability, acceptableness, and usefulness, till, in the autumn of 1851, he closed his career in a death as serene and tranquil as his life had been glowing and active.

Dr. Alexander was one of that order of persons who appear at intervals, whom God endows with extraordinary gifts, and places in conspicuous stations, in order that they may pursue labors and exert influences that are peculiarly needful to the well-being of the church of the time, and are to leave a salutary and deep impress on a vast circle of minds. No other individual in the sacred office during his period had a finer group of faculties, displayed a more spotless, dignified, and lovely character, performed a greater amount of important labor, or exerted an influence more wide, more powerful, and more eminently free from an intermixture of evil. What an illustrious office! What a happy destiny! What a contrast his ingenuousness, nobleness, love of truth, fidelity, to the cause of his master, self-denial, laboriousness, large and salutary influence, success in the various spheres he was called to fill, bear to the career of an ambitious and unscrupulous demagogue who prostitutes his office to the promotion of his personal ends, and assails the truth, and preaches a false gospel, that he may gather a crowd of sycophants who will make him their leader, and exalt him to conspicuity and honor by their homage and flatteries!

The affection and reverence with which he was universally regarded in his last years, present an equally striking contrast to the neglect into which most of the leaders fell of the great religious party that was opposed to him. Not one of that class in New England who thirty years ago played a conspicuous part in the doctrinal controversies that agitated the church, retains a shadow of public respect or influence. They have not merely lost their sway in the church, but they have sunk into contempt. The most restless and noisy of that class also, in the Middle and Western States, have lost their position with their own party as well as with the public. The contrast presented by the closing spectacle answers to that of their respective characters and principles.

2. THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF THE REV. WILLIAM JAY; with Reminiscences of some distinguished contemporaries, selections from his correspondence, and literary remains. Edited by George Bedford, D.D., and John Angel James. In Two Volumes. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1855.

THIS work, though not of much merit as a literary production, is highly interesting from Mr. Jay's pleasing character and eminent usefulness; and from the numerous sketches he has drawn of his contemporaries who were distinguished as preachers, authors, or philanthropists. Mr. Jay, who rose from a humble rank, owed the con-



apicuity and usefulness which he attained, chiefly to extraordinary gifts of voice, intellect, memory, emotion, and presence, that fitted him to be an attractive and impressive extemporaneous preacher. His peculiar talents as a thinker and orator appear to have been perfectly available from his boyhood, so that his first discourses, delivered at sixteen or eighteen, exhibited the special cast of his mind, and were of as high an order as those of his mature years. He had great naturalness, unstudied ease, warmth, and point, and always kept within the sphere of his hearers: preferring to descend in plainness and simplicity to their capacity, rather than to attempt to soar and astonish or dazzle, instead of instructing them. Of the near seventy years of his ministry, sixty-three were spent at Bath, where his attractive style drew many of the wealthy and noble to hear him, and though an Independent, procured him the acquaintance and friendship of a number of distinguished persons of the established church. He exerted a large influence for a long period, chiefly in the sphere of practical religion, and was the means of conducting an unusual number of God's children to the skies.

The most attractive part of these volumes are the sketches from Mr. Jay's pen, of Wilberforce, Hannah More, Rowland Hill, Robert Hall, John Foster, and others. The letters, with which a part of the second volume is occupied, are generally written with ease, and though treating of incidents of the day that have now lost their interest, here and there rise into the region of elegance, and are lighted up with flashes of sprightliness and wit.

One of the most marked features of the present time in Great Britain is the disappearance from the theatre of great and commanding minds like those that have distinguished the nation at almost every period from the Reformation, and shed a halo of dignity and glory over it. Not an orator, not a statesman, not a military or naval commander, not a poet, not an essayist or writer of any sphere, exists at the present time of more than a very secondary rank, compared to the long train of illustrious geniuses that have flourished in every preceding century. An equal change has taken place in the church. Not a single individual remains of the highest rank. The most distinguished are of a medium grade, while but few appear to occupy even so high a place. Nor is this most ominous fact peculiar to them. Is it not equally characteristic of the day here? The age seems to be smitten with a mediocrity of genius, while no crisis in the history of the world was ever more prolific of dangers, or demanded greater talents in rulers and teachers to avert or remedy them.

3. *ON THE STUDY OF WORDS.* By Richard Chenevix Trench, B.D.,  
Professor of Divinity, King's College, London. Redfield : 1855.

THE object of the author, in this highly curious and entertaining work, is to unfold in a measure "the boundless stores of moral and historic truth, and of passion and imagination" that are laid up in words, and the "lessons of worth which we may derive from them contemplated singly;" partly from the necessities that occasioned their invention, and the sources from which they were derived, and partly from the changes of meaning through which they have passed. It is written with the learning, the careless ease, and the singular power of investing slight topics with interest, and educing instruction and amusement from sources that to ordinary writers would prove barren, which characterize Mr. Trench, and shed a peculiar charm over his volumes. This is the most novel and agreeable, we think, that has proceeded from his pen, and cannot fail to yield pleasure to all readers, especially who have a tincture of learning and taste.

The airy graceful mode in which he treats his theme may be seen from the following passage on the morality of words :—

"Is man of a divine birth and stock? coming from God, and, when he fulfils the law and intention of his creation, returning to him again? We need no more than his language to prove it. So much is there in that which could never have existed on any other supposition. How else could all those words which testify of his relation to God, and of his consciousness of this relation, and which ground themselves thereon, have found their way into this, the veritable transcript of his innermost life, the genuine utterance of the faith and hope which is in him? On no other theory than this could we explain that great and preponderating weight thrown into the scale of goodness and truth, which, despite of all in the other scale, we must needs acknowledge in every language to be there. How else shall we account for that sympathy with the right, that testimony against the wrong, which, despite of all its aberrations and perversions, is yet its prevailing ground-tone?"

"But has man fallen, and deeply fallen, from the heights of his original creation? We need no more than his language to prove it. Like everything else about him, it bears at once the stamp of his greatness and of his degradation, of his glory and of his shame. What dark and sombre threads he must have woven into the tissue of his life, before we could trace such dark ones running through the tissue of his language? What facts of wickedness and woe must have existed in the first, ere there could be such words to designate these as are found in the last. There have been always those who have

sought to make light of the hurts which man has inflicted on himself, of the sickness with which he is sick; who would fain persuade themselves and others that moralists and divines, if they have not quite invented, have yet enormously exaggerated, these. But are these statements found only in Scripture and in sermons? Are there not mournful corroborations of their truth imprinted deeply upon every region of man's natural and spiritual life, and on none more deeply than on his language? It needs no more than to open a dictionary, and to cast our eye thoughtfully down a few columns, and we shall find abundant confirmation of this sadder and sterner estimate of man's moral and spiritual condition. How else shall we explain this long catalogue of words, having all to do with sin, or with sorrow, or with both? How came they there? We may be quite sure that they were not invented without being needed, that they have each a correlative in the world of realities. I open the first letter of the alphabet; what means this 'ah,' this 'alas,' these deep and long-drawn sighs of humanity, which at once we encounter there? And then presently follow words such as these: 'affliction,' 'agony,' 'anguish,' 'assassin,' 'atheist,' 'avarice,' and twenty more—words, you will observe, for the most part not laid up in the recesses of the language, to be drawn forth and used at rare opportunities, but occupying many of them its foremost ranks. And indeed, as regards abundance, it is a melancholy thing to observe how much richer is every vocabulary in words that set forth sins, than in those that set forth graces. When St. Paul (Gal. v. 19–23) would put these against those, 'the works of the flesh' against 'the fruit of the Spirit,' those are seventeen, these only nine; and where do we find in Scripture such lists of graces, as we do at 2 Tim. iii. 2, Rom. i. 29–31, of their opposites?

"Nor can I help taking note, in the oversight and muster from this point of view of the words which constitute a language, of the manner in which it has been put to all its resources that so it may express the infinite varieties, now of human suffering, now of human sin. Thus what a fearful thing is it that any language should have a word expressive of the pleasure which men feel at the calamities of others; for the existence of the word bears testimony to the existence of the thing. And yet in more than one such a word is found.\* Nor are there wanting, I suppose, in any language, words which are the

---

\* In the Greek, *τρίχαιρα*, in the German, "Schadenfreude." Cicero so strongly feels that such a word is wanting, that he gives to "malevolentia" the same significance, "*voluptas ex malo alterius*," though it lies not of necessity in the word.

mournful record of the strange wickednesses which the genius of man, so fertile in evil, has invented.

"And our dictionaries, while they tell us much, yet will not tell us all. How shamefully rich is the language of the vulgar everywhere in words which are not allowed to find their way into books, yet which live as a sinful oral tradition on the lips of men, to set forth that which is unholy and impure. And of these words, as no less of those which have to do with the kindred sins of revelling and excess, how many set the evil forth with an evident sympathy and approbation, as taking part with the sin against Him who has forbidden it under pain of his extremest displeasure. How much wit, how much talent, yea, how much imagination must have stood in the service of sin, before it could have a nomenclature so rich, so varied, and often so Heaven-defying as it has.

"How many words men have dragged downward with themselves, and made partakers more or less of their own fall. Having originally an honorable significance, they have yet, with the deterioration and degeneration of those that used them, deteriorated and degenerated too. What a multitude of words, originally harmless, have assumed a harmful as their secondary meaning; how many worthy have acquired an unworthy. Thus 'knave' meant once no more than lad (nor does it now in German mean more), 'villain' than peasant; a 'boor' was only a farmer, a 'varlet' was but a serving-man, a 'churl' but a strong fellow. 'Time-server' was used two hundred years ago quite as often for one in an honorable as in a dishonorable sense 'serving the time.\*' 'Conceits' had once nothing conceited in them; 'officious' had reference to offices of kindness and not of busy meddling; 'moody' was that which pertained to a man's mood, without any gloom or sullenness implied. 'Demure' (which is, 'des mœurs,' of good manners), conveyed no hint, as it does now, of an over-doing of the outward demonstrations of modesty. In 'crafty' and 'cunning' there was nothing of crooked wisdom implied, but only knowledge and skill; 'craft,' indeed, still retains very often its more honorable use, a man's 'craft' being his skill, and then the trade in which he is well skilled. And think you that the Magdalen could have ever given us 'maudlin' in its present contemptuous application, if the tears of penitential weeping had been held in due honor in the world? 'Tinsel,' from the French 'étincelle,' meant once anything that sparkles or glistens; thus 'cloth of tinsel' would be cloth inwrought with silver and gold; but the sad experience that 'all is not gold that glitters,' that much which

---

\* See in proof Fuller's *Holy State*, b. iii. c. 19.

shows fair and specious to the eye is yet worthless in reality, has caused the word imperceptibly to assume the meaning which it now has, and when we speak of 'tinsel,' either literally or figuratively, we always mean now that which has no reality of sterling worth underlying the glittering and specious shows which it makes. 'Tawdry,' which is a word of curious derivation, though I will not pause to go into it, has undergone exactly the same process; it once conveyed no intimation of *mean* finery, or *shabby* splendor, as now it does.

"A like deterioration through use may be traced in the word 'to resent.' It was not very long ago that Barrow could speak of the good man as a faithful 'resenter' and requiter of benefits, of the duty of testifying an affectionate 'resentment' of our obligations to God. But, alas! the memory of benefits fades and fails from us so much more quickly than that of injuries; that which we afterwards remember and revolve in our minds is so much more predominantly the wrongs real or imaginary which men have done us, than the favors they have bestowed on us, that 'to resent' in our modern English has come to be confined entirely to that deep reflective displeasure which men entertain against those that have done, or whom they believe to have done, them a wrong. And this leads us to inquire how it comes to pass that we do not speak of the 'retaliation' of benefits, as often as the 'retaliation' of injuries? The word does but signify the again rendering as much as we have received; but this is so much seldomer thought of in regard of benefits than of wrongs, that the word, though not altogether unused in this its worthier sense, has yet a strange and somewhat unusual sound in our ears when so employed. Were we to speak of a man 'retaliating' kindness, I am not sure that every one would understand us.

"Neither is it altogether satisfactory to take note that 'animosity,' according to its derivation, means no more than 'spiritedness;' that in the first use of the word in the later Latin to which it belongs, it was employed in this sense; was applied, for instance, to the spirit and fiery courage of the horse; but that now it is applied to only one kind of vigor and activity, that namely which is displayed in enmity and hate, and expresses a spiritedness in these. Does not this look too much as if these oftenest stirred men to a lively and vigorous activity?

"And then what a mournful witness for the hard and unrighteous judgments we habitually form of one another lies in the word 'prejudice.' The word of itself means plainly no more than 'a judgment formed beforehand,' without affirming anything as to whether that judgment be favorable or unfavorable to the person about whom it is formed. Yet so predominantly do we form harsh, unfavorable

judgments of others before knowledge and experience, that a 'prejudice,' or judgment before knowledge and not grounded on evidence, is almost always taken to signify an unfavorable anticipation about one; and 'prejudicial' has actually acquired a secondary meaning of anything which is mischievous or injurious.

"As these words are a testimony to the *sin* of man, so there is a signal testimony to his *infirmity*, to the limitation of human faculties and human knowledge, in the word 'to retract.' To retract means properly, as its derivation declares, no more than to handle over again, to reconsider. And yet, so certain are we to find in a subject which we reconsider or handle a second time, that which was at the first rashly, inaccurately stated, that which needs therefore to be amended, modified, withdrawn; that 'to retract' could not tarry long with its primary meaning of reconsidering; and has come to signify, as we commonly use it, 'to withdraw.' Thus a great writer of the Latin church, at the close of his life wishing to amend whatever he might now perceive in his various published works to have been incautiously or incorrectly stated, gave to the book in which he carried out this intention (for they had then no such opportunities as second and third editions afford now) this very name of 'Retractions,' being strictly 'Rehandlings,' but in fact, as any one turning to the work will at once perceive, withdrawals of various statements, which he now considered to need thus to be withdrawn. What a seal does this word's acquisition of such a secondary use as this set to the proverb, *humanum est errare*."

4. THE TRUTH AND LIFE: Twenty-two Discourses by the Rev. C. P. McIlvaine, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Ohio. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1855. •

THESE Discourses, written with freshness and vigor of thought, and naturalness and warmth of feeling, are eminently worthy of their title as "*the Truth and Life*." They treat of subjects that are especially suited to the state of the church at the present time, and present them in Scriptural attitudes, and with great plainness, ease and copiousness of thought, and force. There are no intricate speculations, no wild rhapsodies and random declamations, no dull commonplaces. Every theme appears in its natural sphere, and is invested with the hues that are reflected on it from heaven.

He treats first of the power of the word of God as the instrument of impression and sanctification, and of the church as the promulgator of that word and light of the world; in which he points out in

a very striking manner the proofs the Romish church gives of her apostasy in her exclusion of the Scriptures from the hands of her people, and substitution of her own dogmas and teachings in their place. He next discourses of Christ's presence in the church, the nature of sin, and the free offer of salvation in the gospel. From these topics he passes to the characteristics and duties of the believer, the nature of faith, and the fruits to which it gives birth; and finally closes with a view of the present happiness of the dead in Christ, their speedy resurrection, and their final blessedness in his eternal kingdom. These last subjects we are especially glad to see presented by him. Though they occupy a large space in the Bible, and are among the most attractive and cheering to those who cherish realizing expectations of a future life, they are almost wholly excluded from the pulpit, and to crowds of the people of God, involved in extreme obscurity, and neglected as of little significance.

5. A CYCLOPÆDIA OF MISSIONS: containing a comprehensive View of Missionary Operations throughout the World, with Geographical Descriptions, and accounts of the social, moral, and religious condition of the people, by the Rev. Harvey Newcomb. New York: Charles Scribner. 1854.

THIS work of near 800 pages answers to its title in the minuteness and comprehensiveness of the information it presents on all the themes that belong to the subject. Of the countries which are the scenes of the principal missions—such as Africa, Ceylon, Hindostan, Burmah, China, the Sandwich Islands,—a very ample view is first given of the geography, population, language, literature, civil institutions, and religion: and then a sketch of the missions that have been established there, whatever may be the denomination to which they belong, the missionaries by whom they have been conducted, and the results that have sprung from their labors. Interspersed with these main themes, in alphabetical order, are the several societies that are employed in the support of missions, the names of all missionary stations, and articles on such other topics as need to be known in order to a full understanding of the subject, and the whole is illustrated with upwards of thirty maps. The style is perspicuous and neat; the subjects are treated with judgment and taste; and form a work that has no competitor in its adaptation to its object. It is to missions what a dictionary is to language, what a gazetteer is to geography, and what an encyclopædia is to the whole circle of geographical, scientific, historical, and literary subjects that are comprised in a general system of knowledge.

6. *THE FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL.* By the author of *Morning and Night Watches*, *The Words of Jesus*, &c. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers. 1855.

THIS volume, much after the manner of the geographical and historical parts of Conybeare and Howson's *Life of Paul*, traces the course of the apostle from the earliest notices of him in the New Testament through the scenes of his ministry to his death, describing the great cities in Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, and Macedonia, in which he planted churches, delineating the great features of the countries through which he passed on his journeys, relating the incidents of his travels and voyages, and reciting the persecutions and sufferings he encountered, and the successes with which he met. It is written with much ease and spirit, and though yielding in some cases too much perhaps to the sway of fancy, presents a very graphic and impressive picture of the unexampled labors, self-denials, and achievements, of that most extraordinary man. Besides several maps, the work is illustrated by a number of cuts.

7. *PALEY'S EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY*, with Notes and Additions by C. M. Nairne, A.M. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1855.

THIS work, though not without imperfections, is the ablest Treatise on the subject in the English or any other language; the most clear, the most learned, the most ingenious, tasteful, and candid, and the most unanswerable in its reasonings, while it is inimitable in the perspicuity and neatness of its style, and the appropriateness and grace of its illustrations. Coleridge indeed, and other followers of the modern German speculatists, have depreciated it, and denied even the possibility of evidences of the truth of Christianity, and a crowd of inconsiderate admirers have repeated his denunciation: but his averseness to the work sprang from his idealism, which denying the existence of the external world, denies that there are any media by which the divine institution of a religion, or the existence of God, can be demonstrated. His objection is an objection of atheism accordingly, and is absurd and impious, therefore, to those who believe in the divine Being, the truth of our senses, the reality of the material world, the existence of the human race, and the possibility and fact of a revelation from God. The explanatory and illustrative notes by the editor consist in a considerable degree of quotations.



# INDEX.

## A

Alexander, Archibald, life of, 684.  
Antimillenarians, 152, 327.  
Apocalypse Unveiled, 172.  
Apostolic Commission, 266.

## B

Bonar's Eternal Day, 165.  
Buck's Harmony and Exposition of Matt. xxiv. 158.  
Burgess, Rt. Rev. George, sermons, 512.

## C

Carleton, H., on Antimillenarians, 94. Cotton Mather, 609.  
Characteristics and Laws of Figurative Language, 352.  
Christ's Second Coming, 1, 609.  
Coleman, L., Historical Text Book, 521.  
Conflagration, 473.  
Conversations on Ruling Elders, 349.  
Cooper, J. P., lectures, 347.  
Cummings, John, Voices of the Dead and the Day, and Benedictions, 164.  
Church before the Flood, 169. Scripture Readings, 171. Romanism, 347. Bible Evidences, 512. Daniel, 513. Seven Churches, 518. Revelation, 527.  
Cyclopædia of Missions, Newcomb's, 697.

## E

Eclipse of Faith, Defence of, 350.  
Embarrassments of Antimillenarians, 94.  
Ethical System of the Bible, 666.  
Evidence of Christianity, 620, 698.  
Exposition of Romans (xi. 12, 15, 25), 258.

## F

Figurative Language, Laws of, 352.  
Figures of Isaiah, 145, 306, 433, 625.  
Footprints of Paul, 698.  
Forsyth, John, Jun., D.D. on Primitive Puritans, 446.

## G

Geology and Genesis, H. Miller on, 119.  
Goodell, W., Changes in the East, 351.  
God's government vindicated against Dr. E. Beecher, 50.

## H

Harkness, J., Messiah's Throne and Kingdom, 521. Apostolic Commission, 266.  
Hickok, L. P., Psychology, 353, 529.  
Hints to Antimillenarians, 316.

## J

Janeway, J. J., Hope of the Jews, and Antidote to Popery, 174.  
Jay, William, Life of, 690.  
Judgment, 498.

## K

Kitto, John, Bible Illustrations, 170.

## L

Laws of Symbolization, 177, 386, 575.  
 Lectures on Evidences of Christianity, 520.  
 Life of Paul, 639. A. Alexander, 684. W. Jay, 690.  
 Lord, N., *Essay on Millenarianism*, 342.  
 Lyell's, Sir C., *Manual of Geology*, 163.

## M

Mather Cotton, on Christ's Second Coming, 609.  
 M'Ilvaine, Rev. C. P., *Discourses*, 696.  
 Memoirs of A. O. Taylor, 168.  
 Millenarianism, 94.  
 Miller, Hugh, on Geology and Genesis, 119.

## N

Neander, A., *Church History*, 524.  
 Nicholson, W. R., *Discourse*, 349.  
 Notes on Scripture, Philo, 303, 380, 563.  
 Notices, Literary and Critical, 158, 342, 510, 684.

## P

Parables of the New Testament, 237, 414, 591.  
 Paley, W., *Evidences of Christianity*, 698.  
 Periodicals, British, 176, 351, 525.  
 Philo, Notes on Scripture, 303, 380, 563.  
 Plurality of Worlds, 165, 276.  
 Pond, Enoch, on the Synod of Dort, 33.  
 Prophecy, Symbolic, 171, 349.  
 Protestant Church in Hungary, 510.  
 Puritans, Primitive, 446.

## R

Resurrection, 470.  
 Richards, John, *Exposition of Rom. xi.* 218.

## S

Schauffler, W. G., *Meditations*, 167.  
 Scott, W. A., *Lectures on Daniel*, 519.  
 Stevenson, John, on ciii. Psalm, 517.  
 Sunlight through Mist, 512.  
 Symbolic Prophecy, 171, 349.  
 Symbolization, Laws of, 177, 386, 575.  
 Synod of Dort, 33.

## T

Tactics of Antimillenarians, 152, 327.  
 Tayler, C. B., *Legends*, 517.  
 Taylor, A. O., *Memoir of*, 168.  
 Thornwell, J. H., *Ethical System of the Bible*, 666.  
 Translations of Epistles of Peter, John, and Jude, and Revelation, 162.  
 Trench, Richard C., *Synonyms of N. T.*, 514. Words, 692.

## U

Upham, T. C., *Maxims*, 348.

## W

War of the Great Nations, 500, 680.  
 Weiss, Charles, *History of French Refugees*, 162.  
 Words of Jesus, 176.









**AUG 16 1965**

.

